

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUARANTINE STATION TO PERMIT ENTRY OF ANIMALS TO IMPROVE LIVESTOCK BREEDS

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
H.R. 11832, H.R. 12028, H.R. 13336,
H.R. 14451, and H.R. 14847

NOVEMBER 18 AND 19, 1969

Serial U

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1969

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina,
Vice Chairman

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas
MASTON O'NEAL, Georgia
THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, Texas
JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Pennsylvania
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
B. F. SISK, California
BILL ALEXANDER, Arkansas
BILL D. BURLISON, Missouri
ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, New York
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana
ED JONES, Tennessee
JOHN MELCHER, Montana

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma,
Ranking Minority Member

CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
MRS. CATHERINE MAY, Washington
WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, Virginia
GEORGE A. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
CLARENCE E. MILLER, Ohio
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, California
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota
ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas
JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas
MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, New York
WILMER D. MIZELL, North Carolina

JORGE L. CORDOVA, Puerto Rico
Resident Commissioner

MRS. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*

LACEY C. SHARP, *General Counsel*

HYDE H. MURRAY, *Associate Counsel*

L. T. EASLEY, *Staff Consultant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS

GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas, *Chairman*

THOMAS S. FOLEY, Washington
G. V. MONTGOMERY, Mississippi
JOHN R. RARICK, Louisiana
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, New York
B. F. SISK, California
JOHN MELCHER, Montana

MRS. CATHERINE MAY, Washington
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
THOMAS S. KLEPPE, North Dakota
ROBERT D. PRICE, Texas
KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Kansas

CONTENTS

H.R. 11832, a bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.....	Page 1
Statement of:	
Anderson, Robert J., Associate Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	2, 24
Bendix, Dr. W. L., secretary-treasurer, U.S. Animal Health Association, Richmond, Va.....	18
Chappell, Hon. Bill, Jr., a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.....	40
Clarkson, Dr. M. Robert, executive vice president, American Veterinary Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.....	10
McMillan, C. W., executive vice president, American Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo.....	33
Moore, Jerry, trustee and treasurer, American Simmental Association, Alliance, Ohio.....	23
Price, Hon. Robert D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas.....	27
Purdy, Robert, representing North American Limousin Foundation, Denver, Colo.....	15
Thompson, Peter S., independent Charolais breeder, Easton, Md.....	21
Correspondence submitted to the subcommittee:	
Fitzhugh, H. A., Fitzhugh-Straus Medina Hereford Ranch, San Antonio, Tex., letter of October 23, 1969.....	41
Paddock, Clayton S., president, American-International Charolais Association, Houston, Tex., letter of November 12, 1969.....	22
Plager, Wilbur, American Yorkshire Club, Inc., Lafayette, Ind., letter of November 14, 1969.....	42
Schambers, Doug, chairman, Oregon Sheep Advisory Council, Salem, Oreg., telegram of November 17, 1969.....	43
Sharp, M. W., D.V.M., Castroville, Tex., letter of October 18, 1969...	40

ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUARANTINE STATION TO PERMIT ENTRY OF ANIMALS TO IMPROVE LIVE- STOCK BREEDS

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Graham Purcell (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Purcell, Montgomery, Rarick, Jones of North Carolina, Mayne, Zwach, Price of Texas, and Sebelius.

Also present: Christine Gallagher, clerk.

Mr. PURCELL. The subcommittee will please come to order.

Today we are meeting to have hearings on a series of bills that have been introduced pertaining to the establishment of a livestock quarantine station. It is hoped that the hearings today and tomorrow will be sufficient to hear all those who are interested in this matter. This is a very important endeavor in which many of us think that the U.S. Government should be involved. I think it would be very meaningful to the livestock industry if we can establish a quarantine station, and I appreciate very much all of you being here.

(Following is the text of H.R. 11832, introduced by Mr. Purcell, and which is similar to H.R. 12028 by Mr. Price, H.R. 13336 by Mr. Miller of Ohio, H.R. 14451 by Mr. Foley, and H.R. 14847 by Mr. Mayne:)

[H.R. 11832, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with

such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

MR. PURCELL. The first witness that I will call will be Dr. Robert J. Anderson, Associate Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

So, Dr. Anderson, if you will come around, please, and, if you will, please introduce for the record whomever is accompanying you for its edification of those who are present.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. ANDERSON, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE; ACCOMPANIED BY DR. EVERETT J. WARWICK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, ANIMAL HUSBANDRY RESEARCH, ANIMAL RESEARCH SERVICE; AND HAROLD P. CARTER, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

DR. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Dr. Robert J. Anderson, Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service. I have with me on my left Dr. Everett J. Warwick, Assistant Director of Animal Husbandry Research Division, Agricultural Research Service, and on my right, Mr. Harold P. Carter, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

MR. PURCELL. Thank you. Please proceed.

DR. ANDERSON. I appreciate this opportunity to present the Department of Agriculture's position on H.R. 11832.

The facility proposed is an international, maximum security, import animal quarantine station. It would be established at an offshore location on U.S. territory, under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. American livestock producers, breeders, and research institutions could import foreign animal breeds through this facility, as a means for upgrading the genetic quality of the domestic livestock population.

Because of the security measures that would be maintained at the facility along with the use of laboratory tests and other rigid procedures, livestock and wild animals in the United States would still be protected against exposure to such destructive foreign diseases and pests as foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest. The Department would thus continue to carry out its responsibility for preventing livestock diseases from entering the United States from foreign countries.

There is at present an absolute statutory prohibition against the importation of ruminants and swine, as well as against fresh, chilled, or frozen meat from such animals, if they originate in countries that the Department has declared to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. This prohibition is contained in section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Wild zoo animals are specifically exempted, but only if they are to be exhibited at an approved zoological park. Furthermore, once these animals reach an approved park, they cannot be moved except to another approved geological park.

Other statutes, generally referred to as the animal quarantine laws, broaden the prohibitions and restrictions to include other destructive livestock diseases and pests.

Under Federal regulations prohibitions and restrictions are applied not only to the importation of animals, meats, and animal byproducts, but to all materials as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist. All of these regulations are based on the best and most current scientific information available. This includes the results of research conducted at the ARS Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in Long Island, N.Y.

To date, efforts to accomplish the objectives of these various laws and regulations are proving highly successful. Except for the limited introduction of breeding animals through the proposed facility, the present prohibitory statutes preventing the entry of domestic ruminants and swine, and fresh or fresh frozen meats and meat products would continue.

But this kind of protection is only a part of efforts to keep the American livestock industry prosperous. The marketplace today is far more competitive than it was 50, 20, or even 10 years ago. This means that domestic livestock producers must continually upgrade the quality of their products while achieving further efficiency and economy in production.

Some of the changes that are taking place originate with consumers. For example, a continuing rise in our standard of living is creating stronger consumer demands for more livestock products, particularly beef. And in certain instances, notably meat and milk, this increased demand is highly selective. More and more consumers are looking for new or improved products that contain less fat and greater proportions of other desirable nutrients.

Many such products have been developed, and many more are on the way. But time is the critical element here. The very nature of livestock production makes it most difficult to adjust production patterns and methods quickly.

UPGRADING THE GENETIC QUALITY OF DOMESTIC LIVESTOCK

A basic solution to this problem is the selective breeding and development of animals that possess the characteristics desired. This is at best a slow process. And it is complicated by the fact that the genetic base of some classes of livestock in the United States is extremely limited.

American beef cattle, dairy cattle, and sheep are based on a small number of breeds from a very few countries of origin. Most of them

originated in the British Isles. The Netherlands supplied our most important dairy breed, and France contributed our most important sheep breed. All of these bloodlines were introduced into our country between 60 and 80 years ago.

Today, scientific observations and preliminary investigations suggest that other foreign breeds may have the characteristics we need for meeting current and future needs.

Further, in both theory and practice, it has been found that the more diverse the genetic contributions of the parents, the more vigorous and productive the resulting hybrid will be. This has already been demonstrated in the plant kingdom. By crossing germ plasma from exotic foreign plants with domestic crop plants, plant geneticists have developed many new and high-yielding hybrid varieties that are now grown extensively on American ranches and farms.

Both the American livestock industry and the American consumer, then, stand to benefit from the introduction and organized use of certain foreign animal breeds. The changes desired could thus be brought about more rapidly and efficiently.

Of course, these changes should not be achieved at the risk of introducing a livestock disease or pest not now present in this country. But they could be achieved, we believe, through the application of existing technology on foreign animal diseases and safe and orderly use of the quarantine facility under the absolute control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Some of the specific changes we anticipate could bring about a revolution of sorts in American livestock production. For beef cattle producers, these changes might include increases in weaning weight and in postweaning growth rates and muscularity. Other possible improvements might include a decrease in the proportion of carcass waste, and improved fertility and calf survival. Dairy farmers could look for increases in milk production, fertility, and calf survival.

We anticipate that about \$2.5 million would be needed on a non-recurring basis for constructing the facilities. We further estimate that maintenance and operating expenses will total about \$1.3 million annually.

Maintenance and operating costs would be offset largely by collecting fees from importers for use of the quarantine facilities. Such fees would cover costs involved in the care, feeding, and handling of animals during the quarantine period. Fees would also cover other costs incident to quarantining the animals. These costs include expenses for equipment, utilities, fences, supplies, and materials—to the extent that these items are not covered by appropriations.

In this connection, the budgetary situation is such that we are now implementing plans to reduce Federal funds for construction. Because of this, we would have to consider the need for increased appropriations to construct and operate the proposed quarantine station along with other high-priority programs of the Department.

The Department recommends enactment of H.R. 11832 with the following amendment:

On page 2, line 6 after the "period" add the sentence:

The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement.

I will be glad to answer questions.

Mr. PURCELL. Thank you very much, Dr. Anderson.

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Montgomery, do you have any questions?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Zwach?

Mr. ZWACH. Dr. Anderson, is this special area in livestock research the one in which you are thoroughly grounded?

Dr. ANDERSON. Mr. Congressman, I am a veterinarian and the Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service which conducts research on foreign animal diseases, on livestock breeding, and we carry out programs of animal disease control and eradication. In the Department, we have the scientific competence considered necessary to operate and carry out the functions of this bill as it was intended.

Mr. ZWACH. To your best knowledge, there are foreign countries breeds of cattle and livestock that, if brought in and used, crossed with our own, that would perhaps improve the quality and other features of our livestock industry; is that your belief?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. Our livestock breeders—and Dr. Warwick to my left here is a geneticist and is Assistant Director of the Animal Husbandry Research Division—are of the opinion that they have knowledge of foreign breeds not now in this country, which if introduced and crossed with our domestic breeds would bring about a revolutionary change in livestock production particularly the beef cattle. As I mentioned, it would increase the hybrid vigor and do much toward improving our breeds.

Mr. ZWACH. Is there now any restriction on the in-movement of semen for crossing purposes?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. Semen from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists is very stringently regulated, and it is possible that the cost is almost prohibitive. But it does provide a means of introduction if it is so desired. The cost for an induction of a lot of semen will run somewhere between \$25,000 and \$30,000 to bring this under our supervision and stringent tests, so this would place \$20 to \$30 a vial for such semen, and then it would be only a means for bringing in a part of the desired germ plasm because it would be much faster if they had the opportunity to bring in females.

Mr. ZWACH. It is your real conclusion that this type of a facility, a quarantine facility, would adequately protect our own livestock production against hoof-and-mouth and these other diseases?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, we are satisfied that animals brought in under the safeguards that are proposed with these facilities would not be a means of introduction of foreign animal diseases.

This means bringing to bear the technology of our foreign animal disease expert at Plum Island Research Laboratory and bringing to bear all of the knowledge on the foreign diseases in foreign nations. It also will bring to bear experience that Canada has had for the past 5 years in the operation of a maximum security quarantine station on Grosse Ile. We have participated in the operation there as an observer, we are satisfied that the procedures and safeguards that they are now apply-

ing are adequate to prevent the introduction of foreign animal diseases into North America.

Mr. ZWACH. Is there any other country that is doing a better job in animal research and in improvement, than our own country?

Dr. ANDERSON. I would say that the new foreign germ plasms that the Canadians are bringing in under their quarantine system has given them the edge over our livestock producers and animal breeders.

Mr. ZWACH. You know, I am a cattle feeder.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. That is my business.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. And I buy western cattle and feed them on my feedlots in Minnesota, and I am aware of what crossbreeding does.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. It adds vigor, the growth, and the more vitality. So, I am particularly interested in this area, but I am also interested in keeping out disease. So, I am very interested in this legislation and hope to be able to support it.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. Well, we are satisfied that it will provide the necessary safeguards to prevent the introduction of diseases.

Mr. ZWACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Has any decision, tentative or otherwise, been made as to where this station would be located?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir. We think it would be preferable to locate it in the Caribbean region. We have made a rather limited survey of possible sites. We have looked at about 15 different ones, and some of them we believe offer a pretty good opportunity. They are all on U.S. territory.

Mr. MAYNE. I noticed in an article that was made available to us that the Virgin Islands were being considered as a possible site. Is that true?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; one of the islands. I might mention the locations of the places that we have looked at without indicating which one might offer advantages over the other. We need to look into this very closely. We have looked into the Culebra Island off the coast of Puerto Rico; Vieques, another island off the coast of the mainland of Puerto Rico; Buck Island; St. Croix, and St. John and St. Thomas, the three of them being the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MAYNE. Where, on St. Thomas?

Dr. ANDERSON. We do not have any particular location at this time. It is all private land, and it really says here there is no suitable site. We have looked at it, but we have come up with a preliminary decision that there is no suitable site on the island of St. Thomas.

Mr. MAYNE. Now, the Canadian one, is it Grosse Ile, at Montreal?

Dr. ANDERSON. Grosse Ile, an island in the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. MAYNE. At Montreal?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think close to Montreal.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, I would just like to know what your reasons are for having it so remote from the continental United States when the Canadians, who also have many islands available, have put theirs right next to their principal city?

Dr. ANDERSON. We believe that it is an added precaution. If anything should go wrong that would require the destruction of all of the animals, then we would feel more comfortable if it were off of the mainland. However, you could build a facility on the mainland. However, we would feel more comfortable with it off of the mainland.

Mr. MAYNE. Has there been any consideration of how much more expensive it would be to be shuttling department personnel over into the Caribbean, back and forth, as contrasted with something a little closer to home?

Dr. ANDERSON. We believe that the areas I mentioned here would not result in any material increase in expense over some island a little closer to the mainland. We would still have similar expenses.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Price?

Mr. PRICE. Dr. Anderson, what quarantine facilities does the United States presently have?

Dr. ANDERSON. We have the quarantine facility at Clifton, N.J. We also have one at the Miami Airport. Those facilities are solely for the handling of animals from countries other than those where foot-and-mouth disease exists such as Ireland, North Ireland, and other countries that are not on the list of countries declared infected with foot-and-mouth disease. They also handle race horses and breeding horses from European countries, but they do not handle any cattle or ruminants or swine from countries where there is foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest.

Mr. PRICE. In other words, neither one of those stations handles cattle, sheep or hogs?

Dr. ANDERSON. Not from foot-and-mouth countries.

Mr. PRICE. What do you think would constitute an adequate quarantine facility to handle this sort of thing?

Dr. ANDERSON. The estimated \$2.5 million that I mentioned in my statement would provide space for the introduction of about 300 head of cattle per year.

Mr. PRICE. How about lambs and hogs—sheep?

Dr. ANDERSON. At the present time, our technology of disease testing is not considered to be adequate to allow the introduction of swine or sheep. The research people are working on it, and perhaps, in the not too distant future adequate knowledge of the disease will be such that we can also bring in swine and sheep safely, but we do not now consider that our state of knowledge would warrant such introduction.

Mr. PRICE. Well, what diseases are you specifically talking about? It seems to me like it would be rather an adequate facility with the technology that we have today, where we would be able to introduce sheep and hogs along with it.

Dr. ANDERSON. These are the diseases that we are speaking of in cattle, primarily foot-and-mouth disease. But, we can detect the carrier animal in cattle with accuracy. In the case of swine and sheep, the same tests are not equally as effective.

Mr. PRICE. Is not hoof-and-mouth disease transmittable in semen also?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE. In livestock or in cattle?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE. It is transmittable.

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRICE. What facilities and what tests do you have that would prevent that from happening?

Dr. ANDERSON. Under our present regulations, there is a provision where you can bring in semen from foot-and-mouth countries. First, you test the animal and determine the extent possible that it is safe and disease free. Then, you proceed with the collection of the semen. We take 10 percent of the semen and send it to our Plum Island Laboratory where part of it is injected into live animals subcutaneously or interabdominally to determine whether or not it is free of the virus of foot-and-mouth disease. That is where some of the terrific costs occur in the importation of semen. It costs \$25,000 to \$35,000 a lot to get it through all of these required inspections and tests before it would be considered safe for importing.

Mr. PRICE. Does Canada, at their station, do this presently?

Dr. ANDERSON. It depends on the different sources of the animals. The animals coming to a U.S. quarantine station, would have to originate on a premise that is free of the disease; must be an animal that has never been exposed to disease; the animal must be 6 months of age or younger, and the area where it originates has not been infected for the past year. If you start from that premise and apply all of the tests and the quarantine, it does not require the testing of the semen. All of the other laboratory tests involve serum tests including testing the material that is obtained from the throat using the probang. So, the animal is judged to be free of the disease. If you bring in semen from an animal that is born and raised to adulthood, perhaps, it may have been vaccinated in a foreign country; then, you would have to subject the donor animal to all of these other tests, including testing the semen in live animals before you can judge that semen to be safe.

Mr. PRICE. Would you not say the whole question here of whether to establish a station or not to establish a station turns on the threat of introducing hoof-and-mouth disease into this country? The opponents against it say that we would be risking the introduction of hoof-and-mouth disease into this country. Is this not really what the struggle is between? We know we need it, but there is also a great alarm about the introduction of foreign diseases into this country, is there not?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, that is true. That is the basis for the statute that prohibits the introduction of animals and animal products from such countries. It was only in recent years that we have reached the conclusion that cattle can be brought in with safety. With the more recent development of technology, our scientists have been able to determine that certain animals from certain parts of the country, subjected to certain tests and quarantine can be judged to be free of foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. PRICE. Can foot-and-mouth disease be introduced into the United States through the raw meat that is being imported into this country at the present time, just as well?

Dr. ANDERSON. No raw meat is permitted entry from a country where foot-and-mouth disease exists, such as Brazil, Argentina, and other South American countries. That meat must be fully processed in a

manner to destroy the virus. It is fully cooked before it is permitted entry into this country.

Mr. PRICE. That is all.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Sebelius?

Mr. SEBELIUS. No questions.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Rarick, do you have any questions?

Mr. RARICK. I have no questions.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, Dr. Anderson, just one or two questions now, following up what Mr. Price was asking you. With the situation as now exists and allowing cattle to be brought into the United States through the Canadian quarantine station, we are now bringing in cattle into this country, and have been for some 4 or 5 years, that have originated in these countries that have had foot-and-mouth disease—my point being that it would be better for us to run a quarantine station than to depend on the Canadians. It would be even better protection from the spread of foot-and-mouth disease, or any other disease, if we had full control over this facility. We would also have what I would consider more assurance of having an honest operation because there would be less costs involved which tends to lead, in this area, to shady practices sometimes.

Do you see any added threat of the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into this country if we had a quarantine station, as compared to our using the Canadian quarantine station?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir, I do not. I think, as I mentioned earlier, the success and safety of this operation depends upon the attention to very minute detail of quarantine and testing as well as attention to the individual animals that are being imported with the entire operation under the direct supervision of USDA veterinary officials. So, we do not believe that it would add to the risks at all.

Mr. PURCELL. I do not want to belabor this and keep you in the witness chair too long. We have other witnesses. But in connection with your having suggested an amendment here that would allow private money to be used to help build this station, I think that you and others in the Department have contemplated what might be a problem developing from such a recommendation. I can see the desirability of it, but I can also see that an assumption would be raised, I would suppose, that a given individual who is going to put some money in it ought to get some kind of favored treatment in getting the first few animals or getting some of the animals out of the first several.

Now, does this present a problem that you think would be so severe it would be impossible to make it work and still be fair and equitable to the treatment of all of those who wanted to import animals?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir. The Department would not enter into an arrangement or an agreement with any person or parties on the basis that they would be given any preferential treatment as far as the permits for the use of the facilities.

Mr. PURCELL. What are you going to do if a bunch of Congressmen start calling down there and say:

What are you doing to old Joe from my District? You took a bunch of his money, and I want you to give him better treatment.

Are you going to be tough enough to ward off that kind of an attack?

Dr. ANDERSON. We expect that we would establish a committee made up of geneticists and animal breeders and people knowledgeable in livestock breeding to pass judgment on the request for a permit to determine, first of all, what kind of a breeding program is planned. We would expect that the allotment of permits would come from such a body. If there were more permits requested than would be issued under that arrangement, we, very likely, would have to resort to some lottery system or drawing.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, you certainly have thought of the problems that this might present, and you feel that there would be an adequate way to work it out and handle it?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, I believe we could.

Mr. PURCELL. Equitably?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PURCELL. Now, Dr. Anderson, if there are no further questions from the members at this time, would it be possible for you and your colleagues to be here for the rest of the morning?

I have some more questions, but I want to be sure that we have heard from those witnesses who may have come from out of town and recall you, if you may, before we close the hearings today.

Dr. ANDERSON. We would be pleased to remain.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, thank you very much. And, if you will, stand aside.

Congressman Price, we had you down to be heard first.

Mr. PRICE. Just go ahead.

Mr. PURCELL. Then, we will next call Dr. Robert Clarkson, executive vice president, American Veterinary Medical Association.

Dr. Clarkson, if you will come around, we will be glad to hear from you, sir.

Dr. CLARKSON. Mr. Chairman, I have with me Dr. Frank Todd, Washington representative of our association.

STATEMENT OF DR. M. ROBERT CLARKSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.; ACCOMPANIED BY DR. FRANK A. TODD, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dr. CLARKSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) appreciates the invitation to present its views on this important legislation. Protection of the health of the Nation's animal resources is a vital concern of the members of the veterinary medical profession.

The strains of livestock and poultry already available for breeding purposes in the United States are among the finest in the world, with considerable genetic diversity of the parent stock. Nevertheless, it is recognized that genetic material from other areas of the world would add to the vigor, increase the versatility, and enhance the efficiency of our native herds and flocks. The AVMA has not made an independent study of these needs but is aware of some of the statements made by others, notably the Agricultural Research Service of USDA.

The United States, in common with the other countries of North America, is free of several of the most devastating animal diseases that

plague many areas of the world with a constant drain upon the efficiency of livestock and poultry production. Foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest are the most widespread and generally recognized as the most dangerous of these foreign animal diseases.

Rinderpest has never occurred as a disease in North America and no outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred on this continent since 1954. Parenthetically, I might say that the disease is believed to exist on the island of Cuba. However, there have been a number of introductions of foot-and-mouth disease into North America from other continents—once in Mexico, once in Canada, and six times in the United States, since 1900. Each outbreak has been eradicated after tremendous effort by governments, livestock owners, and others, with substantial losses and the expenditure of large amounts of money.

The six outbreaks in the United States occurred during the first 30 years of this century. During the succeeding 40 years, in spite of enormously increased trade and traffic between the United States and all countries of the world and the occurrence of serious outbreaks in nearby Mexico, Canada, and Cuba, there have been no outbreaks in the United States. This prolonged period of freedom of the United States from foot-and-mouth disease did not just “happen.”

State and Federal veterinarians have maintained a vigilant watch over the movements of livestock, livestock products, and other materials that might harbor the virus of the disease. More important than this, however, was the action taken by the Congress in 1930 when strong legislative authority was given to the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent the movement into the United States of the most likely carriers of the disease, that is, certain animals and animal products, from countries where these diseases exist. Without that legislation it is not likely that the efforts to prevent the introduction of the disease would have been effective.

For many years it has been the position of those most knowledgeable about foot-and-mouth disease that no change should be made in the controlling legislation. However, with the advancement of knowledge about the disease and the development of procedures to detect the virus in carrier animals—at the present time, only in cattle—it is possible to devise procedures for the importation of carefully selected susceptible cattle from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists without introducing the disease into North America. H.R. 11832, if passed, would provide the basis for such importation not only for the United States but also for the other countries of North America.

Current knowledge of rinderpest and the characteristics of the causative virus is sufficient to guide rigid procedures of inspection and quarantine to guard against introduction of this disease.

Mr. Chairman, the American Veterinary Medical Association supports this legislation. In doing so, we recognize that the establishment of the quarantine facilities with necessary safeguards will be an expensive undertaking and that the costs of operations will be very high. We recognize that there will be many extremely difficult problems connected with the administration of the act. With these points in mind, we urge that the committee report concerning the bill include the following:

1. A direction to the Department to make full use of current knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease, derived from both research and ex-

perience, and apply without deviation all necessary requirements to prevent introduction of these diseases into any part of North America.

2. A statement that access to the quarantine facility must be restricted to surface carriers. Shipment of animals by air inevitably creates problems of alternate landing sites, none of which would be equipped to provide the necessary safeguards against disease transmission.

3. A provision that no animals be brought to the quarantine facility until all necessary buildings, equipment, and staff are available.

4. A direction that provision be made for the immediate destruction and disposal of all susceptible animals exposed to any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest that may occur at the quarantine station.

5. A statement that adequate measures be provided to protect against the introduction of other important communicable diseases including, but not limited to, tuberculosis, brucellosis, scabies, trichomoniasis, vibriosis, anaplasmaosis, and piroplasmosis.

The State veterinarians and the livestock industry of each of the States have a tremendous stake in this undertaking. In common with the Department, they must bear the brunt of any accident or careless handling that may occur in the administration of the proposed legislation.

It is recognized that administration of the proposed legislation would be entirely a Department responsibility. Nevertheless, much valuable assistance may be obtained from State veterinarians and others. The record of cooperation between the State and Federal Governments in the prevention, control, and eradication of animal diseases and the record of the Department in administering animal quarantine laws give confidence that the proposed legislation would be administered fairly and firmly. The American Veterinary Medical Association pledges its support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Thank you, Dr. Clarkson.

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Dr. Clarkson, I was interested in your second point that the quarantine facility act be restricted to surface carriers. Now, if this facility were to be on one of these small islands, would it not be rather difficult to arrange for the transportation of this livestock?

Do you anticipate any difficulty there?

How large, for example, would this shipment be to this facility?

Dr. CLARKSON. I cannot answer that. I would have to leave that to the Department. As to the size of the shipments, these would normally be high-priced breeding stock, and probably would not be very large in numbers, perhaps 20 or 30.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, I can see the danger of air shipments because of the necessity to go to alternate airports, but on the other hand, I do not quite see how a small shipment could proceed with existing commercial surface traffic. It looks to me like they would almost have to charter a small vessel to bring some of these to some of these islands.

Dr. CLARKSON. Well, I am obviously not an expert in shipping matters, but there are freighters that carry traffic of all kinds throughout the Atlantic. From my observations, I would conclude that they would

take a shipment of 20 or 30 animals anywhere that the owner wanted to have them sent, along with other cargo destined for other ports.

Mr. MAYNE. Well, I am not an expert on ocean traffic either, but it would seem to me that there would be no problem in getting such a shipment to a place like Grosse Ile., but a very considerable problem in getting it to some of the smaller islands that have been discussed.

That is all.

Mr. PURCELL. Any other questions?

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, one brief question.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Zwach.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Clarkson, you say we would need a strict requirement that in case of an outbreak all animals exposed would be slaughtered; would that mean that all of the animals at this station would need to be slaughtered?

Dr. CLARKSON. Yes; unless there are facilities at this station that would give absolute assurance of isolating one lot of animals from another.

Mr. ZWACH. There is really a lot of danger here. These are high-priced animals. Who will bear the cost?

Will the importer bear the cost if his animal is killed if the disease shows up. Or will the Government? Will we be stuck with this?

What is your recommendation in this area?

Dr. CLARKSON. I should not think that the Government should have to bear that cost.

Mr. ZWACH. You would think that the importer should have the liability that when he has his animal there and there is another one brought in that gives that disease to his animal, that this is his liability?

Dr. CLARKSON. It is one of the recognized hazards in this type of movement.

Mr. ZWACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Price?

Mr. Sebelius?

Well, now, Dr. Clarkson, in connection with those questions that Mr. Zwach was asking, about the only remedy for stamping out this foot-and-mouth disease is the eradication of animals that are known to have it and those who have been exposed to it; is this not true?

Dr. CLARKSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PURCELL. So, this is the same procedure that has been used in this country and was used extensively in Mexico in the early 1950's, or the 1940's, or whenever that last outbreak was there?

Dr. CLARKSON. This would be, in miniature, the same kind of procedure that would have to be used for stamping out an outbreak, if it should be allowed to come into this country.

Mr. PURCELL. Yes.

All right. Are there any other questions?

Mr. Rarick?

Mr. RARICK. Doctor, several of these diseases that you have mentioned can be carried by wild animals, can they not, animals such as birds, ducks, and other game birds?

Should an outbreak occur on a nearby island would it not be possible that some wild fowl could contaminate the cattle in the interior with these diseases?

Dr. CLARKSON. Well, I do not recognize any of these diseases as being likely to infect birds. I also recognize that any of them could be carried for short distances by birds as mechanical carriers. I would assume—and certainly insist—that the animals on the quarantine station be protected against any contact with wild birds.

Mr. RARICK. What would you estimate to be a reasonable distance offshore to offer a protective guarantee against the possible spreading of diseases by wild life?

Dr. CLARKSON. Well, I think it is the protective features on the island and its isolation from traffic of the mainland that is important rather than the distance. In the case of birds, the longest distance that I know about that they have been presumed to have transmitted a disease was about 30 miles.

Mr. RARICK. Thirty miles?

Well, we are talking about offshore islands. Some of the islands are coral islands which are really connected to the continental United States. Then there is Staten Island, which could be considered as a quarantine facility—it would qualify as an island but it certainly would not have the isolation feature we are discussing.

Dr. CLARKSON. Well, I would point throughout the Plum Island where, as Dr. Anderson referred to, the laboratory that studies foot-and-mouth disease and a long list of other diseases not known in this country with absolute safety, and it is very close to the mainland of Long Island. It is the facilities and the quarantine procedures that account for more than the distance, in my opinion.

Mr. RARICK. I thank you, Doctor.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES. No questions.

Mr. PURCELL. Doctor, I will not get into a discussion—and, in the first place, I could not discuss them if I tried—on all of these diseases. But all of you emphasize rinderpest—and at one time I knew the definition of that, but I have forgotten it—for the record—and maybe I am the only one up here that does not know what it is. But tell us, at least, what that disease is, sir?

Dr. CLARKSON. Rinderpest is a disease primarily of cattle that is caused by a filterable virus. It is very highly fatal. The death rate runs up into the order of 75 or 80 percent in outbreaks that are uncontrolled. There are rather effective vaccines against it that are used in Africa, Asia, where the disease exists regularly. It is not nearly so difficult to diagnose, nor is it so difficult to guard against and the procedures devised by the Department and which were described here by Dr. Anderson a short time ago would, in our opinion, be perfectly acceptable against rinderpest.

Mr. PURCELL. Dr. Clarkson. I want to ask Dr. Anderson, too, but I will ask now:

Do you know whether or not we ever had a quarantine station off in the gulf below either the northern part of Florida or Mississippi or along there somewhere—or Alabama?

Dr. CLARKSON. Yes, sir. In the late 1940's, the Congress authorized, and the Department constructed a facility on Swan Island, which is not too far off the coast of Yucatan, Mexico. This was authorized before the outbreak in Mexico, and it was thought that procedures that were to be put into effect then would be sufficient, but with the ex-

perience gained from the outbreak in Mexico, it was concluded that we did not, at that time, have sufficient knowledge to go forward with it, and the project was abandoned, and the legislation was rescinded.

MR. PURCELL. Well, as far as you know, that was the only facility that was ever contemplated other than those we already know about?

DR. CLARKSON. To my knowledge, yes, sir.

MR. PURCELL. There were not any way back in the early teens or some 40-odd, maybe 40 or 50, years ago that you are aware of?

I do not know either. I am asking.

DR. CLARKSON. I am not aware of any; no, sir.

MR. PURCELL. All right. Thank you very much.

MR. PRICE?

MR. PRICE. Is Plum Island at the present time being contemplated to be phased out?

DR. CLARKSON. Not to my knowledge. I certainly hope not.

MR. PRICE. Well, I had heard this, and I just wondered if you knew anything about it?

DR. CLARKSON. I would be greatly surprised and disappointed if it were.

MR. PURCELL. We can take that up with the Department.

Well, thank you very much, Dr. Clarkson.

DR. CLARKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PURCELL. Is Mr. Robert Purdy here at this time?

Mr. Purdy?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT PURDY, REPRESENTING NORTH AMERICAN LIMOUSIN FOUNDATION, DENVER, COLO.; ACCOMPANIED BY RICHARD GOFF, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NORTH AMERICAN LIMOUSIN FOUNDATION

MR. PURDY. Mr. Chairman, I have with me Mr. Richard Goff, who is the executive vice president of the North American Limousin Foundation.

MR. PURCELL. We will be very glad to hear from you gentlemen.

MR. PURDY. I am Robert Purdy, Purdy Ranches, Buffalo, Wyo. I am engaged in the ranching business, and I am presently president of North American Limousin Foundation and a past president of the American International Charolais Association.

The principal point I would like to make in regard to the proposed U.S. quarantine station is that the need for this facility is far greater than most people in our own industry realize.

Cattle from countries where hoof-and-mouth disease and rinderpest are endemic are coming to this country through a similar facility in Canada. Our USDA veterinarians are looking over the shoulders of the Canadian veterinarians. Greater safety would be insured by setting up our own facility. The present minimum quarantine station at Clifton, N.J., is unsatisfactory even for the overtaxed facilities presently being used for testing zoo animals that come from countries where dangerous disease exists such as hoof-and-mouth and rinderpest. American cattlemen are paying millions of dollars to Canadians for these genetically superior cattle, marked up as much as 10 times their cost.

At the present time there are only six Limousin bulls on the North American Continent, all in Canada, whose semen is available to American cattle breeders. The cost of most of the semen from Canadian imported bulls varies from \$6 to \$100 per 1-cc. ampoule of semen. At an average of $1\frac{1}{2}$ ampoules to breed a cow, it means from \$9 to \$150 per calf just in semen cost, and this is for only one crossbred calf, as there are no purebred Limousin females in the United States. This compares with such domestic semen at \$2.50 to \$4 per ampoule.

The need for increased efficiency in U.S. beef production is critical if the U.S. cattle industry is to survive. This new genetic material is the quickest and best way to increase beef production and be able to maintain reasonable prices to the consumer.

I believe it is entirely possible that if such a facility were made available tomorrow, you would have applications within 48 hours for permits to import at least 500 head of Limousin cattle alone in the first importation.

We urgently solicit your approval for a U.S. quarantine station and assure you that it will benefit the entire beef industry.

In addition to my written statement, Mr. Chairman, I have some other comments I would like to make. It just came to my attention—a new magazine produced by Farm Journal, called Top Op. In it is an article entitled “Let’s Get That Quarantine Station.” It is written by one of their editors, Wayne Palmer. In it, I noticed a statement or a quotation from Senator Hruska, and I quote:

“The Department of Agriculture cannot continue to send American veterinarians to these nations to accompany foreign livestock through all of the elaborate quarantine controls,” declares Senator Roman Hruska, Republican of Nebraska. “Nor can we afford to take the risk of not sending veterinarians.”

Gentlemen, smuggling has been a threat to our country, and I have only hearsay information. However, I do know of semen that has been smuggled out of France into a neighboring country that is a threat to our country. I feel that if we had a quarantine station of our own the economic need for this would be reduced and consequently the threat of possible smuggling would be much reduced.

I started looking into this in 1962 and first started with Dr. Clarkson who just testified here, and in 1964 I saw the USDA plan for the importation of semen directly from France. To my knowledge, only one shipment has been made which comprised approximately 1,000 vials of semen, at least the amount that was produced in the period of 60 days. This cost \$25,000 just for this one small shipment.

Then, in the fall of 1964, the Canadians announced their program, and, consequently, the program that the USDA had proposed fell apart. It was so much cheaper, and we bought our cattle from the Canadians then.

However, the price that the American cattleman has to pay the Canadian for any of these imported bulls is prohibitive. I was offered a Simmental bull 2 months ago, a purebred Simmental bull, delivered to the United States. The price was \$100,000—just the calf. In addition to that, they wanted semen rights, which would be an additional \$30,000. I just do not happen to have \$130,000 that I am interested in putting into such a project as this, but I am sure that somebody will come along and pay the price.

Gentlemen, I think, very seriously, we need this quarantine station as badly as we need anything. Production and crossbreeding is vital to the American cattlemen.

If there are any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

Mr. PURCELL. Any questions?

Mr. Zwach?

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Purdy, I see you are a past president of the Charolais International Association.

Mr. PURDY. Yes.

Mr. ZWACH. They make pretty good crosses. Are these you are talking about now better, in your opinion?

Mr. PURDY. I would hate to have to get into an argument about which of these are better.

Mr. ZWACH. In your opinion. I am not asking you for an argument.

Mr. PURDY. At this point, sir, I am in it, because of economic reasons. These cattle are all green, so far as I am concerned. I would not want to say that the Simmental or the Limousin or the Charolais—that one is a better animal than the other. It depends entirely on what your program is.

The Simmental, for instance, are well known for their milk production. If your cattle need more milk, Simmental would be a very good animal to introduce into your breed. If you need better marbling facilities and easier calving, Limousin is very good.

Mr. ZWACH. Now, if you were shipping a group into this new facility and they had to be destroyed, you would expect to carry insurance or protect yourself to take this loss?

You would not expect the Government to pay indemnity?

Mr. PURDY. No, sir. I have already imported animals from England through Canada and through Clifton, N.J. I bought the insurance policies that would insure me if any of these animals have to be destroyed. And the permittee would be expected to and would expect to carry this liability.

Mr. ZWACH. You expect that ought to be this way on this new facility, too?

Mr. PURDY. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Any other questions?

Mr. Mayne?

Mr. MAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

You say you have imported cattle through Clifton, N.J.?

Mr. PURDY. Yes, sir. They came from the Isle of Man in England. They were progeny of French animals that were originally shipped to England, and the Isle of Man. They were not the original animals; they were progeny of these animals.

Mr. MAYNE. So that was why it was not necessary for them to go through Grosse Ile?

Mr. PURDY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, Mr. Purdy, we thank you very much. I think your statement was very meaningful to us, and I agree with you completely.

Mr. PURDY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. PURCELL. Do you have anything in the way of a prepared statement, Mr. Goff?

I did not mean to cut you off.

Mr. GOFF. That is quite all right. Mr. Garst called this morning, and due to a cancellation of his flight because of weather, he was not able to be here, and I merely wanted to explain his absence, and he sent his apologies and regrets at not being able to be here.

Mr. PURCELL. If you are in contact with him, you may tell him that we would be glad to file any statement as a part of this record, if he wishes to submit one.

Mr. GOFF. Thank you very much.

Mr. PURCELL. Dr. W. L. Bendix, Secretary-Treasurer, U.S. Animal Health Association of Richmond, Va.

We will be glad to hear from you, Dr. Bendix.

STATEMENT OF DR. W. L. BENDIX, SECRETARY-TREASURER, U.S. ANIMAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION, RICHMOND, VA.

Dr. BENDIX. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

The U.S. Animal Health Association appreciates the opportunity to present its views on this important legislation. This bill touches on a subject that is of vital importance to our Nation and specifically to our association, its interests and objectives. The members of our association include scientists in the Federal Government, scientists in the State governments of all the States, scientists in the research institutions throughout this country and abroad, both private and public, and members of industry. Our association is the forum wherein co-operative programs are developed to control or eliminate serious infectious diseases of our livestock population. Preventing the introduction of foreign or exotic infectious diseases of livestock is, of course, of vital interest also to our membership and to our Nation.

The strains of livestock and poultry already in the United States and available for breeding purposes are certainly the finest anywhere. There is, however, strong demand for new strains commingled with what we already have to bring about specific desired improvements. It is felt that these desired improvements can be brought about more rapidly in our own breeding stock by the introduction of foreign breeds, types, and strains than by limiting ourselves to these accomplishments using only our own. Some of the things the livestock industry apparently is interested in accomplishing would include: (a) beef cattle—an increase in weaning weight, postweaning growth rates, muscularity, decreased carcass waste fat, and improved fertility and calf survival; (b) dairy cattle—an overall increase in milk production per cow, and again improved fertility and survival rates in the young; (c) eventually, sheep—an increase in lambing rate, improved lamb growth rate, muscularity, and a decrease in carcass waste fat; (d) eventually, swine—an increase in prolificacy, muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

The U.S. Animal Health Association has not made an independent study of these needs, but we certainly are aware of the feeling, both in industry and in large segments of the scientific community, that the availability of genetic material from certain areas of the world now

denied us could add to the vigor and enhance the efficiency of our native herds and flocks.

In spite of the benefits which may be derived from this type of operation, the importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries now denied us must not be done certainly at the risk of introducing diseases not now present in this country. Should this happen, it would not only offset any benefits that we might have derived from the genetic material itself, but it would result in greatly reduced livestock production here at home.

It would appear that if we must satisfy both objectives—that is, provide complete protection against the introduction of foreign animal diseases not now present in this country, and also provide the type of genetic material determined to be necessary from areas of the world now denied us—certainly, the only way we could then accomplish this would be the establishment of an international quarantine station under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. We have, to some extent, participated in the development of such a quarantine station operated by the Canadian Government and, under certain protocols developed jointly by our scientists and theirs, this type animal can be brought into the United States after a prolonged sojourn in Canada, following clearance through their quarantine station. This caused grave misgivings at the time it was first developed among many of our States, and it is only fair to say that a great many scientists in this country are not happy with this arrangement.

The U.S. Animal Health Association would greatly prefer that entry continue to be prohibited into this country to animals and animal products from areas of the world where exotic diseases exist that do not presently exist in the United States. During the first third of this century, the United States experienced six outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease, one of the most dreaded of the exotic diseases existing in other areas of the world. Large sums of money were necessary to eradicate these outbreaks after the disease had been introduced here. During the second third of the century, we had had no outbreaks of this disease, even in the face of greatly increased international trade and traffic. Serious outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred in Mexico and Canada, and there is evidence to suggest that this disease now exists in the island of Cuba. Continued vigilance by the veterinary staffs of both State and Federal Governments, supported by the action taken by the Congress in 1930 to provide the necessary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, has accomplished this. It is extremely hard for us to quarrel with success.

We are aware, of course, that with the advancement in knowledge about foot-and-mouth disease and others, and the development of procedures to detect various viruses in carrier animals, particularly cattle, it is possible to devise procedures from the importation of susceptible cattle where foot-and-mouth disease exists without introducing this disease into the North American continent. H.R. 11832, if passed, would provide the basis for such importation. We would like to repeat that we would prefer in this instance to maintain the status quo, but if we are to have an international quarantine station with conditional right of entry for animals and animal products presently refused, then certainly it must be under the exclusive control and authority of our

own Secretary of Agriculture and his scientists. It is in this context that the U.S. Animal Health Association supports this legislation. Others have stated, or will no doubt state, that the establishment of such quarantine facilities with the necessary safeguards will be an extremely expensive undertaking and that the cost of operation also will be high. In discussing this bill with other interested groups, certain specific points developed that we feel deserve serious attention. We are sure that these points will be brought out by others, or perhaps already have been, but we would like to reiterate them in the hope that they will be included in the committee report concerning this bill. These points would include, but not limited to, the following: Dr. Clarkson outlined these five points earlier this morning in discussing this matter, and in discussing this matter with Dr. Clarkson a week ago, or so, we simply wanted to reiterate and support these five points. I will not bother to take the committee's time to read them over.

Mr. Chairman, again on behalf of the U.S. Animal Health Association, I wish to express our appreciation of this opportunity to express our views to you and to the committee.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, thank you very much, Dr. Bendix.

I am sure that I do understand your statement, but to delve into it a little bit, I am sure no one wants to create a situation where any new danger of importing diseases exists; but would you agree that inasmuch as the law now provides, and the practice has developed, that these animals are brought into Canada that—as I think you have stated already you do not believe it would be much better off to have absolute control of quarantine facilities ourselves, with our size industry, that whatever regulations were necessary to promulgate and enforce would be of our doing, and also, from an economic standpoint, you have an adequate control over the management of it as far as the possibility of bootlegging and unfair numbers coming in. I am not implying that there has been any bootlegging in Canada, and I have not ever heard about that. That has to do with health actually, but I have been talked to several times about the fact that animals were being brought in at high, tremendously high, expense to those in this country where this just seems to be clearly an unnecessary thing, impractical, and unfair.

Now, I realize that my question turned out to be a speech, but do you agree or disagree?

Dr. BENDIX. We agree completely, Mr. Chairman, with that point of view. If we are going to have this, then there are compelling reasons why we should certainly seriously consider it must be our own and it must be completely controlled by our secretary.

Mr. PURCELL. Any other questions?

Well, thank you very much, Dr. Bendix.

Our next witness is Mr. Peter S. Thompson, from Easton, Md., who is to be introduced by Congressman Rogers C. B. Morton.

Mr. MAYNE. I am sorry to see that Congressman Morton has shrunk this morning.

STATEMENT OF PETER S. THOMPSON, INDEPENDENT CHAROLAIS BREEDER, EASTON, MD.; ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM O. MILLS, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO CONGRESSMAN ROGERS C. B. MORTON

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. Congressman Morton has shrunk a bit. My name is William Mills, administrative assistant to Congressman Morton. It is impossible for him to be here, and I am sitting in his stead.

My purpose is solely to introduce to you a neighbor, business associate, and close personal friend of Congressman Morton.

Mr. Peter S. Thompson is a cattle breeder from the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and a gentleman whose knowledge and judgment has the unrestricted confidence of Congressman Morton.

So, at this time, I would like to introduce to you Mr. Peter S. Thompson of Dorsey Farm, Easton, Md.

Mr. PURCELL. We are delighted to have you, Mr. Thompson, and we will be glad to hear your statement at this time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure for me to appear before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains.

I am here in the interest of Mr. Purcell's bill, H.R. 11832, to establish an international quarantine station which will permit the safe entry of animals from other countries into the United States.

I am Peter Thompson, and I am a businessman and also a breeder of purebred livestock. As an owner of a herd of Charolais cattle, I sell breeding bulls to the general livestock industry as well as a few animals to other purebred breeders. As a businessman, I share the concern of many as to the plight of the farmer. Over the years we have seen the cost-price squeeze erode the economic position of farmers throughout America. This economic phenomena has caused a drastic change in rural America and has contributed more than is generally recognized to the overpopulation and overcrowding in the cities. As the farmers' profits were reduced relative to the growth of our total national economy, rural America became less a place of opportunity for literally millions of people who subsequently moved to the cities.

In my opinion, Government can help correct this situation but Government will be only one of the factors. The farmer himself is going to have to become a more efficient and well-informed manager.

In the livestock industry the rate of growth of the animal is a vital economic factor. The efficiency of that growth in terms of feed conversion also has tremendous effect on the final profit of a livestock operation. Charolais cattle, and there are other breeds, have been selected over the years on the basis of size, scale, rate of growth, quality of meat, and other factors. Through Charolais cattle, commercial operators have found a way to upgrade the cattle which they sell from their farms and ranches. Second owners have recognized this and are paying a premium for cattle destined for the feed lot which have a substantial amount of Charolais blood.

It is good economics for us to import enough of these cattle, a breed developed primarily in France, in order to satisfy the market demand for quality crossbreeding. These remarks could have been made about other breeds of livestock developed in other parts of the world, which have the potential for contributing substantially to the industry's economic growth. Because of the length of time required in the selection process to develop an improved breed, this country should take every advantage of work done in all parts of the world in the breeding of better livestock.

While citing the utility of and need for greater availability of foreign breeding stock, I by no means wish to deny the importance of protecting the health of the livestock we already have. But I do wish to point out that one of the systems we can use to avail ourselves of the best of both worlds is proper quarantine and careful health management during the entry process of foreign livestock.

If we are going to develop the kind of herds that are required to feed America during the 1980's and 1990's and on into the next century, there will have to be many new elements brought into the livestock industry. It will have to become more efficient; cattle will have to be larger; and yields and conversions will have to be higher. One of the ways we can do this is to take advantage of the worldwide opportunities. It seems to me then, that the proposed quarantine station would be a very healthy investment for the Department of Agriculture in terms of return for the American farmer and the American economy.

I also, Mr. Chairman, represent the American International Charolais Association, and I have been asked by their president, Mr. Clayton Paddock, if I might, to read a letter addressed to Mrs. Christine S. Gallagher, clerk of your committee, stating the position of the A.I.C.A.

(The letter, read by Mr. Thompson, follows:)

AMERICAN-INTERNATIONAL CHAROLAIS ASSOCIATION,
Houston, Tex., November 12, 1969.

Mrs. CHRISTINE GALLAGHER,
House Agricultural Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GALLAGHER: The American-International Charolais Association, the world's fourth largest beef cattle breed with more than 9,000 members, wholeheartedly supports HB-1182 by Congressman Graham Purcell to "provide for the establishment of an offshore international quarantine station and to permit the entry of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes." This bill will be discussed in a hearing by your committee November 18, 1969, and is identical to Senate Bill S 2306, introduced by Senator Hruska in that body.

This Association for many years has urged the establishment of such a station, and reaffirmed its support and encouragement for such a station at meetings of its board of directors in Kansas City, Missouri, October 17, 1969, and at San Antonio, Texas, February 10, 1969.

Financing of the station *could* be obtained through private subscriptions. Operation of such facility would be on a self-sustaining fee basis, for all practical purposes eliminating government expenditures. Quotas could be established for each breed utilizing the facility.

The annual benefits of such a station to the United States Beef Industry was estimated at \$1 to \$1.5 billion annually in a special study recently made by Dr. R. E. Hodson, director of the Animal Husbandry Division, Agriculture Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, titled "Importation and Evaluation of Exotic Germ Plasm to Improve Livestock". We refer you to this.

This new sperm plasm would widen the genetic base of some classes of livestock now being developed in the United States from an extremely narrow genetic base. Science has demonstrated high potential of crossbreeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in production.

Science has further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossbreeding, the greater the benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and the product characteristics.

The report further emphasizes that the use of certain exotic (imported) breeds of livestock can bring about desirable changes in production technologies much faster than the same changes could be achieved within present U.S. breeds through long years of selection.

Your approval of this bill in committee and your active support in obtaining its passage by the House is greatly needed for further expansion of the American Beef Industry, and is urged by this Association. If this Association can be of any assistance in the implementation of this bill, please let us know.

Sincerely,

CLAYTON S. PADDOCK, *President*.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Are there questions of Mr. Thompson?

Any questions of Mr. Mills?

He might give us a lecture on the desirability of this improved importation?

If there are no questions, we thank you very much.

Mr. Mills, we appreciate your being here.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. PURCELL. Now, I am going to ask that Dr. Anderson return in just a moment, but now I happen to know that Mr. Jerry Moore, who is active on the Simmental breeders, is here—and Mr. Moore, I will not ask you to testify, but could you give us just a one- or two-sentence statement, please, sir, as to whether or not you know of any opposition or lack of approval of this idea from the Simmental breeders of the United States?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir. Everything we have heard so far we agree with.

Mr. PURCELL. I am not asking you to speak for the association, but to your knowledge those who are interested in the Simmental breed are just as vitally interested as these other witnesses have indicated, the other breeders?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a statement also.

Mr. PURCELL. Thank you, sir. Your statement will be made a part of the record.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Moore reads in full as follows:)

STATEMENT OF JERRY MOORE, TRUSTEE AND TREASURER, AMERICAN SIMMENTAL ASSOCIATION, ALLIANCE, OHIO

My name is Jerry Moore. I reside on the Moore Ranch, Industry Road, Alliance, Ohio, where I maintain a herd of some 375 brood cows, largely of Hereford breeding. I am also a trustee and treasurer of the American Simmental Association.

My own experience and the observations I have made of cattle operations throughout the country have made me keenly aware of the need for the introduction of new genetic material into the American cattle industry. This is why I am testifying today on behalf of the establishment of a major security livestock quarantine station for the United States.

The income of the American cow-calf operator depends upon three factors: (1) percentage calf crop; (2) weight of the calves at sale time (usually at weaning); and (3) price. The last named factor is determined by general economic conditions as well as the quality of the calves offered for sale. Our big problem as cattle producers is to keep that calf crop high and to have good weights at sale time. Many are finding this increasingly difficult. Selection for beef characteristics alone, to the exclusion of other factors, has severely limited the milk producing ability of the average American beef cow and has depressed the weaning weights of their calves. Fertility is also a matter of some concern among cattlemen who are finding it difficult to maintain a high percentage calf crop.

Consequently, American cattlemen have been eyeing some of the Continental breeds in the hope that those breeds might be able to help them solve these problems. One of these breeds was introduced into this country 20 years or so ago and has been propagated by the use of high percentage crossbred animals until more recently the purebred animals became available. This breed has proven beyond a doubt the value of new blood. Yet, because of stringent import restrictions the prices of these cattle are unreasonably high and the fulltime commercial cattleman can ill afford to avail himself of their potential.

More recently, other Continental breeds of cattle have been introduced into Canada and cattlemen in the United States are using the semen from these bulls in an attempt to breed their cows by means of artificial insemination. This semen is quite expensive, though, and for many of us inexperienced in the technique of artificial insemination the conception rates are uneconomically low. They result in calf crop percentages even poorer than those we are trying to correct.

It seems obvious that the only real solution to the problems contingent upon the current Canadian monopoly of Continental imports, is the construction and operation of a United States quarantine station similar to the one now operated by the Canadians on Grosse Ile, and the one the French are about to open on St. Pierre, Miquon. Such a station would not only enable the American cattleman to obtain the necessary imports but would give the veterinary and sanitary officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture direct control over those imports.

The latter is a most important consideration. These officials are charged with protecting the livestock industry of this nation against the entry of disastrous foreign diseases. Yet under the present setup they must rely primarily upon the activities of officials of foreign governments. Without casting any reflection upon those officials, it is obvious that our people are at a distinct disadvantage in attempting to enforce protective regulations over which their control is secondary.

As an owner of a brood cow herd primarily Hereford in breeding, I am interested in availing myself of the services of purebred Simmental bulls. The indications are that crossbred cows resulting from these bulls would continue to give me cattle of a color pattern highly acceptable to American buyers, while at the same time, significantly increasing the weight and gainability of those calves. There are, I am sure, thousands of American cattlemen who are also of this opinion and who would like to have the opportunity to try such genetic material without having to pay the exorbitant price, in time as well as money, that is now necessary when bringing cattle or semen through Canada.

For this reason I urge this committee to give favorable consideration to this bill for the construction and operation of a United States major livestock quarantine station.

Thank you.

MR. PURCELL. Now, Dr. Anderson, could you come back to the front, sir, with your staff people?

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT J. ANDERSON; ACCOMPANIED BY DR. EVERETT J. WARWICK AND HAROLD P. CARTER—Resumed

MR. PURCELL. Now, there are one or two things that I want to ask you and I did not ask you before, but now do you have some suggested or proposed layouts or drawings?

I saw some of you people bring in a long package that looked to me like such a package. Now, was that you or somebody else?

DR. ANDERSON. That must have been somebody else, Mr. Chairman. We have not developed the drawings to the point that they would be presented at this time.

Mr. PURCELL. All right.

Now, I hope that this is not off the subject here, but it concerns me, Dr. Anderson, that we seem to have spent many years on several diseases and we do not seem to be much better off than we were before.

Now, is there anything you can tell us in regard to the importation or the detection of foot-and-mouth disease in sheep and swine that would lead us to believe that we are close to the development of a method whereby we could safely bring in these animals under the same type circumstances as we now might bring in cattle?

Dr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, we discussed this point with our research people about a month ago. They were not in a position to predict any possible schedule when this might occur. They merely stated that they were optimistic that they would be able to develop test methods that would eventually lead to bringing in these other species with safety. One of the tools that we have that is available for the cattle is called a "probang" test. It is an instrument that draws a sample of mucons and tissue from the throat area or the tonsillar area where the virus of foot-and-mouth disease is most likely to occur in the case of a carrier animal. The test is regarded as an exceptionally good tool in our diagnostic procedures on cattle. But, it is not as accurate and reliable in the case of swine and sheep. We are still confident that they will be able to make a breakthrough within the near future. But until then we just do not believe our diagnostic capability is such that we could afford at this time to allow the entry of sheep and swine from foot-and-mouth countries.

Mr. PURCELL. Now, to your knowledge, has there been any slowdown or cutback in the money available for the continuing study in this particular instance?

Dr. ANDERSON. No, sir; except the small cutback that we all have had to experience because of ceilings on hiring and budget outlay ceilings. The research work is not curtailed any more than any other of our operations as far as funds are concerned. We had hoped that within the next year or so we would be able to expand our research activity at Plum Island to give it a broader diagnostic capability.

Mr. PURCELL. Now, if all of our scientific work in this particular connection carried on at Plum Island in regard to swine, sheep, cattle, in regard to what you keep referring to as exotic diseases—I have been impressed this morning about all these exotic breeds, and we have got exotic diseases. It must be that those in the business do not have any larger vocabulary than I have. You could think of something better to call it than "exotic," but all of the work is carried on at Plum Island in that connection; is that correct?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; all of our research on foreign animal diseases—that is, those diseases which are not endemic or common to this country—is conducted at our Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory. This includes African swine fever, rinderpest, foot-and-mouth disease, Rift Valley fever, and numerous other diseases of cattle, sheep, and goats that do not exist in this country.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, at the risk of getting even further off, now, where is our work done in connection with "blue tongue?" I realize that it is an export problem and not an import problem so much.

Dr. ANDERSON. Practically all of our research on blue tongue is conducted at Denver, Colo. We have a research laboratory there that car-

ries out research on blue tongue virus and the vectors of blue tongue virus.

Mr. PURCELL. Who, at your level—does this come under you, or who is in charge of that here in Washington?

Dr. ANDERSON. In Washington, we have a Deputy Administrator for Farm Research who is responsible for several research divisions. One of those divisions is the Animal Disease and Parasite Research Division, and it is responsible for the Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, for the National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa, and for the one also at Denver.

Dr. Paul Delay is the division director.

Mr. PURCELL. All right. I will not pursue that further, but this is an area that we must do a lot of work in, it seems to me.

Dr. ANDERSON. I might say that the Department has expanded its efforts in the research on blue tongue for the purpose of trying to develop a diagnostic test that could determine the blue tongue status of an animal, whether it was a carrier or whether or not it was free of the disease. The expansion has been somewhat modest. But, we have expanded our efforts somewhat in that area.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, what I was worried about—and I can only speak for myself, but I think the other members will agree, and you can carry the word back—is that we cannot move too rapidly in that area. I have been impressed with the figures given with regard to the economic benefit in the importing of animals, but I am absolutely convinced that we are depriving ourselves of many millions of dollars of export livestock business per year by not being able to send our cattle to primarily Australia but many other places. They are badly in need of our kind of animals and not these new breeds, particularly. So, I would hope that that would be emphasized.

Now, there were a few questions asked a while ago about the location of the quarantine station. To my knowledge—and I will ask you if you know of one—we just do not have an island that would be convenient to commerce as this island that Canada has. I guess you could say "Staten Island," that there might be some places like that, but my little bit of research indicates that we just do not have an island at the mouth of a river or an island just a very few miles from an already established port or a center of commerce. Is this your understanding?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. We have not made a complete survey, but the work that we have done failed to reveal any such island that would be close to the mainland.

Mr. PURCELL. Again, speaking only for myself, I think that there are islands in the Gulf of Mexico that may be under the control of the Interior Department or some other department other than Agriculture that they may have some islands earmarked for seashore development—or no matter what, but I would hope that we could get a very careful analysis of all U.S.-possessed land in the form of an island that is as economically as well as scientifically located, and then let some of us—if it is impossible for the Department itself to use a little influence—see what can be done toward making it available for this, because it can be of economic importance, and it certainly should be done, first, as to the scientific requirements but, second, and very important, as to the economic requirements brought into being for some

of the very facts that Mr. Zwach and, I think, Mr. Mayne and others have brought out. So, we will be glad to work with you, and I will be in touch with you as to the further development of it.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. ZWACH. I have one.

Dr. Anderson, it is true, is it not, that other countries import a great deal of livestock, breeding stock, from America, from the United States?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. So, they have the benefit of our research and know-how. The idea of this bill is to give us the benefit of research in other countries?

Dr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. Because we furnish a great deal of it, I am sure, to other countries.

Dr. ANDERSON. That is right. This opens up the whole new avenue of using germ plasm that is not available to our breeders.

Mr. ZWACH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Any other questions?

All right. Again, thank you, sir.

Mr. Price, one of our own colleagues, a very distinguished man in the field of agriculture, dedicated to his responsibilities, brilliant in his performance, is now available, finally, to be heard.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT D. PRICE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate being afforded the opportunity to testify before my fellow members on the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee.

The issue before the subcommittee today is whether or not the United States should establish an international livestock quarantine station. This is an issue I have been interested in for several years; for, prior to being elected to Congress, I spent most of my adult life as a rancher and cattleman in the Texas Panhandle. As a result of this personal experience, I speak with some knowledge on this subject.

My position on the issue is a matter of public record. Early in this session of Congress, I introduced legislation to provide authority for the Department of Agriculture to establish and operate an international quarantine station within the territory of the United States. My bill also permits the movement of animals into the United States which would otherwise be restrained or prohibited from entry under our animal quarantine laws.

Based on my experience, I believe that an international quarantine station would be of great benefit to our livestock industry, an industry which has become a leading component of the agricultural sector of our economy.

The importance of the livestock industry is evidenced by the fact that during the first 6 months of 1969, the livestock industry produced \$13.4 billion in cash receipts of the \$20.5 billion produced by the entire farm sector.

The livestock industry has been a leader in the farm sector for many years. In recent years, however, it has experienced a surge in size and vitality, which has been caused in large part by increased consumer demand for meat of all kinds.

The industry has responded to this stimulus of consumer demand by altering production and initiating innovations designed to provide high quality meat at a reasonable cost to the American consumer.

Producers, in an attempt to improve the competitive position of the industry are constantly striving to improve the quality of their product and lower their costs of production so that both they and the consumer can enjoy a higher return on their dollar. One important means by which the livestock producer is trying to capitalize on his capabilities through experimenting with different animal bloodlines.

Crossbreeding animal bloodlines has become common practice in the American livestock industry. Experience has demonstrated that the products of crossbreeding have a significantly higher capacity for both gain and the production of desirable cuts of meat.

Livestock experts have unequivocally declared that if the hybrid vigor of the American livestock industry were increased, it would have widespread beneficial effects for the industry and the Nation as a whole, in several respects. It is estimated that increased hybrid vigor would boost by three, the number of calves raised per cow bred.

Leaving my testimony for a moment, I understand that one of the nations in Europe has sheep now that produce on an average of three lambs per calving; also that in hogs they have an average litter of 17 pigs compared to ours which is much less.

Returning to my statement. Hybrid vigor would, also, affect sheep and swine in much the same fashion. This is an important increase; increasing the potential production percentage by three would permit a reduction in the present number of beef cows by about 1,200,000 animals without sacrificing current production levels. Inasmuch as annual cow maintenance costs are estimated at \$80 to \$90, this would mean that the 3-percent rise in calf productivity would create a production cost savings amounting to between \$96 million and \$108 million at present production levels.

It is estimated that hybrid vigor also increases the average weaning weight of a calf by about 90 pounds. The economic value of this increase would be realized by virtue of the fact a hybrid calf would gain more pounds of pre- and post-weaning feedlot gains and would require fewer days on feed before reaching market weight. In this connection, the hybrid vigor could possibly increase feedlot gain by one-half to 1 pound per day. Accordingly, feed required per pound of gain would be reduced by about \$7 and the producer would save about 3 weeks time in the feedlot. This would create significant cost savings which could be passed on to the final consumer in the form of lower market prices for meat.

According to USDA figures, yet another projected benefit of hybrid vigor is that it would reduce waste fat on carcasses of finished slaughter animals by 4 pounds per 100 pounds of carcass weight. The economic importance of this reduction can be illustrated as follows: It is currently estimated that waste fat represents 20 percent of carcass weight. Assuming that the 20 million cattle now on feed average 600 pounds per carcass, a reduction of 4 pounds per hundredweight of

carcass equals 24 pounds per head. This savings has two implications: at present levels of production, the amount of edible beef would be increased by about 480 million pounds or around 21½ pounds of beef for every man, woman, or child in the United States. In addition, present levels of production could be maintained with 800-thousand fewer animals.

Mr. Chairman, under present law, livestock producers cannot take full advantage of the many benefits to be derived from crossbreeding because livestock from many countries around the world is excluded from the United States. The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, contains absolute prohibition against the importation of ruminating animals and swine, except certain wild animals for zoos, and fresh, chilled, or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by the Department of Agriculture to be infected with hoof-and-mouth disease and other destructive animal diseases and parasites such as African swine fever, rinderpest, exotic ticks, and African horse sickness. As an administrative measure, Federal veterinary officials are assigned to various points of entry to the United States. There, with the assistance of trained inspectors, they inspect animals and animal products, poultry and poultry products, hay, straw, and similar materials that might carry destructive animal diseases into the United States. Those animals and materials that do not pass inspection are refused entry.

While I certainly agree that the Federal Government has the responsibility to see that our Nation is not infected with foreign animal diseases that would endanger our livestock industry and reduce its production, it also has the responsibility not to discharge this obligation in such a fashion that it forecloses a major avenue of improving livestock quality. In my view, the present policy of the Federal Government prohibits, as a practical matter, the full use and benefit of crossbreed experimentation. This condition is not a beneficial one; both the consumer and the producer suffer. I believe that the much needed balance between disease protection and livestock improvement can be best achieved by the Federal Government's establishing an adequate international quarantine station on an offshore island where the U.S. Department of Agriculture can effect maximum security precautions to prevent diseased animals and materials from entering the country.

Faced with the rigid prohibitions of the Tariff Act, livestock producers have tried to create hybrid vigor and provide better beef and dairy products at a lower cost to the American consumer by experimenting with our domestic livestock genetic base. They have been hampered in their efforts, however, because the genetic base of many classes of our livestock is rooted in only a few of the many breeds of the world. In fact, in some cases, our present breeds are based on the relatively few strains of animals that were imported from Northern Europe some 60 to 80 years ago.

The Federal Government has not been entirely blind to the production needs of the livestock industry. In an effort to facilitate the efforts of livestock producers, the Agriculture Department issued regulations in 1965 that would permit, under very stringent restrictions, the importation of animal semen from certain countries declared to be infected with destructive animal diseases or pests. To date, these regulations have only been utilized once; although, currently, the Depart-

ment is reviewing two other inquiries about the importation of bull semen from countries adjudged infected with hoof-and-mouth disease.

According to livestock producers, more requests for the importation of animal semen have not been submitted to the Department of Agriculture because of the disadvantages attendant to the practice. The most important disadvantage seems to be that semen imports do not permit the establishment of a purebred nucleus for future breed expansion. Since the importer can obtain only the male side of the genetic strain, he has to continue repeated importations of animal semen in order to maintain his hybrid experiments. In addition, potential importers have complained that the importation of semen is excessively costly in relation to the benefits received; consequently, it is difficult for any but the largest producers to profit from such imports.

Since the middle sixties, livestock producers, in an effort to import live animals from foreign countries which are considered unsafe under the Tariff Act, have looked to Canada for a source of live animal supply. Canada operates two international animal quarantine stations. When animals are imported into Canada from countries that are infested with destructive animal diseases or pests, they must pass through strict quarantine procedures. The effectiveness of these procedures is attested to by the fact that no animal carrying hoof-and-mouth disease has ever been released from either of the two Canadian quarantine facilities.

Canada has proved to be a recent source of bull semen for American livestock producers. In addition, a few of the animals themselves have been imported into the United States from Canada, but only after being subjected to rigorous export controls. Canada requires its exporters to obtain an export permit, a permit which only covers a limited number of specified animal breeds. Within these breeds, export privileges have only been granted for male animals, never for females. Canada makes this distinction for the obvious reason that it wants to protect its monopoly position with regard to the importation of foreign livestock.

From the American livestock producer's point of view, the disadvantages to relying on foreign beef imported from Canada is threefold:

(1) American producers are confined to bidding on Canadian surplus livestock. If there is no surplus above Canadian domestic needs, American producers go begging.

(2) Since the Canadian exports are limited to live female animals, American producers cannot establish a purebred nucleus for future breed expansion, without importing the necessary semen from Canada.

(3) The cost of obtaining foreign animals from Canada is prohibitive. It has been estimated that it costs at least \$5,000 per head to buy livestock declared safe by the Canadian Government.

In looking at this situation from the national interest point of view, it seems to me that American reliance on foreign livestock imported from Canada has certain disadvantages. The initial one is that since many animals are imported from Canada, it would be desirable if the United States controlled the importation and quarantine apparatus. As it stands now, the Department of Agriculture sends American veterinarians to meet any livestock shipments from foreign lands to Canada which would ultimately be purchased by U.S. producers.

This, the Department concedes, is an expensive and burdensome procedure.

The same disadvantages also apply to our running checks of other countries such as Argentina, France, Germany, and Italy, who are seeking to establish quarantine stations for the purpose of shipping livestock into this country.

In my view, if the United States were to establish an adequate international livestock quarantine station of its own, it would solve in large measure the problems and needs that the livestock producer experiences in regard to the importation of foreign livestock.

The establishment of an adequate international livestock quarantine station would also give rise to other desirable conditions. Livestock producers would be able to import and critically evaluate selected foreign breeds not now present in the United States for their ability to improve livestock productivity and livestock quality. In addition, since the facility would be a Federal one, the Department of Agriculture could conduct research in the area of hybrid vigor and publish a running account of its research for the use and benefit of the livestock industry. The Department can also establish an ongoing system for the importation by private industry of larger numbers of breeds or types of livestock that are found to have significant potential usefulness in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is absolutely essential for the United States to establish an adequate international livestock quarantine station if the livestock industry is going to meet the rising demand for meat caused by our rapidly growing population. The Bureau of the Census estimates that by the year 2000, which is not long off, we will have 100 million more people in this country than we have today. By the year 2015, our population will be increased by yet another 100 million people. This will place a tremendous strain on the productive capabilities and adequacies of our domestic livestock industry. For example, Government experts have estimated that if the cattle industry is to meet consumer demand in the year 2000, the industry will have to produce calves that will have a weaning weight of between 600 and 700 pounds, as compared to the 300 to 400 pounds weaning weight that calves presently have under normal conditions.

I might add at this point that in Colorado there is a breed of cattle now, and this man here has records where he has weaned calves between 600 and 700 pounds.

The livestock industry can meet the challenges of the future only by the full use and benefit of hybrid vigor. This in turn necessitates the establishment of an adequate American international livestock quarantine station. Through the activities, the research, and the experiments of such a facility, every American will be able to enjoy a greater variety of high-quality livestock products at a reasonable cost in the future.

MR. PURCELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Price. I think this has been a very meaningful statement and shows a lot of research work on your part.

You have really gone into this, and your thoughts on this, I am sure, will have a great effect on the subcommittee.

Do you have some questions?

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague from Texas for his presentation and also for his hard work for the benefit of agriculture and countryside America.

Mr. PRICE. Thank you very much.

Mr. PURCELL. This concludes the witnesses that were scheduled to appear today. The subcommittee will stand in recess now and meet at 10 o'clock in the morning to continue hearing testimony on these bills.

We will now be recessed until 10 o'clock in the morning.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., a recess was taken until 10 a.m., Wednesday, November 19, 1969.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUARANTINE STATION TO PERMIT ENTRY OF ANIMALS TO IMPROVE LIVE- STOCK BREEDS

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIVESTOCK AND GRAINS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10:10 a.m., in room 1301, Longworth House Office Building, the Honorable Graham Purcell (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Purcell, Montgomery, Jones of North Carolina, Melcher, Mayne, Zwach, and Sebelius.

Also present: Christine Gallagher, clerk, and Hyde H. Murray, associate counsel.

Mr. PURCELL. The subcommittee will come to order.

This morning, we have the pleasure of having a man that is very knowledgeable and always makes a real contribution to our meetings; Mr. Bill McMillan of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

Mr. McMillan, we will hear you now.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF C. W. McMILLAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. McMILLAN. The American National Cattlemen's Association sincerely appreciates this opportunity to appear before the committee and endorse enactment of H.R. 11832 which provides for the establishment of an international livestock quarantine station by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Some years ago, our association looked with disfavor upon the establishment of a similar quarantine station in Canada. Our fears were based entirely upon the dread that foot-and-mouth disease would gain entry into the United States. After long and serious discussions with the U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists, assurances were given that testing techniques had been developed to the point where, if properly followed, any latent foot-and-mouth virus in any animal originating from a country known to be infected with the disease could be detected.

Since that time, the project has been successful and animals have been brought into the North American Continent without foot-and-mouth disease having been discovered. However, this does not lessen our

association's concern that every possible means should be employed to prevent foot-and-mouth disease from gaining entry into the United States or any spot on the North American Continent.

There is a demand for the entry of new germ plasm so that the beef cattle herds of the United States can continue to be improved, thus assuring the consuming public of a constant supply of high-quality, wholesome beef for the years to come. Research has demonstrated that a great potential exists for crossbreeding which can increase the vigor, growth, and in many cases the efficiency of cattle production. Coupled with this, has been a desire that wider genetic diversity of the parent stock be available in order that hybrid vigor can be developed.

The Canadian cattlemen, of course, recognize this same thing. As a consequence, they are not permitting live animals to be shipped to the United States through their quarantine facilities. This opens the door for subterfuge and possible circumvention of the quarantine laws. Cattle might even be smuggled into the United States, thus creating an even greater danger of foot-and-mouth infestation because no quarantine would have taken place.

Because there is no apparent need for new germ plasm in the United States, and because we feel that the germ plasm should be brought in under the most stringent quarantine and sanitary conditions, we feel a strong need for a U.S. quarantine station to be built. With the location of such an "International Quarantine Station" as proposed by the Department of Agriculture in the Caribbean, we feel that the proper conditions can be maintained, thus preserving the foot-and-mouth disease-free status of the United States.

There could be economies associated with our own quarantine station as well. The Department of Agriculture currently has to send American veterinarians to those nations and accompany these foreign livestock through all of the elaborate quarantine controls. This is necessary because the USDA cannot afford the risk of not sending veterinarians to see that every precautionary procedure is followed. Obviously, the more countries that seek to do this, the greater the expense to the American government, and the more difficult it is to supervise the increasingly diverse systems of quarantine control of other nations. Similar problems exist in the case of zoo animals coming into the United States.

In summary, because the quarantine procedures will be under the control of our own scientists, the likelihood of foot-and-mouth disease gaining entry into the United States through such an "International Quarantine Station" will be very minimal. The potential benefits to our livestock industry and to the consumers of the United States certainly justify such a station. The fees to be charged for the use of the station by those importing the animals will make it largely self-sustaining. Consequently, there would be little cost to the taxpayers of the United States.

The American National Cattlemen's Association respectfully requests early action on H.R. 11832 so that we might move forward on this very important project.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I will be happy to try to answer any questions that members of the Committee may have.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Mayne, do you have any questions?

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. McMillan, I notice in your statement you seem to assume that this would be someplace in the Caribbean; is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAYNE. I am a little concerned about having it that distance from the continental limits of the United States that it is going to be unnecessarily expensive. As you know, the Canadians have theirs just outside of their principal city, Montreal.

From what I have seen down in the Caribbean, it is quite an expensive operation in transporting various Government officials down there, and, of course, we have to have congressional inspection teams, too, and the total cost—and the cost to the interested citizen who wants to see it or potential cattleman who may be interested in this, it is going to be a lot more expensive for him to go down there, too. Is your organization wedded to the idea of it being located in the Caribbean rather than somewhere closer to the action?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, Mr. Mayne. We are interested in the most practical location—obviously practical from the standpoint of economy, but more so to maintain the most stringent quarantine conditions. In discussions that I have had with Department of Agricultural officials and other representatives of our organization, the matter of the Caribbean has been the one most frequently discussed by the USDA scientists. However, we will abide by the wishes of the scientists and where they feel they can maintain the best quarantine conditions.

Mr. MAYNE. Thank you.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Montgomery, do you have any questions?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch on the costs to the Agriculture Department and also to the cattlemen.

Will the cattlemen, under this bill, in your judgment, have to pay for part of this expense to quarantine the cattle and clear them?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir, although the mechanics have not as yet been fully worked out. I think what they are proposing is something similar to the procedures that are followed in Canada. The costs for feeding, and maintaining the animals while in quarantine are borne by those who are bringing the animals into the country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think someone testified yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that it would be quite expensive, quite an expensive project, but they still thought it was worthwhile.

Maybe the chairman—or maybe the witness could give us a cost figure?

I know if you buy an island, you are really talking about a lot of money, and I wonder if anybody has put any thought on the cost of this project?

Mr. PURCELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes.

Mr. PURCELL. I do not believe I have the statement of the Department witness who appeared yesterday before me, but I think—I am just trying to remember—he testified it would be about a million and a half a year. But, as far as obtaining the property, the hope would be that they would be able to locate an island that the U.S. Government already owns.

Now, the testimony yesterday—I do remember—was that about \$2.5 million would be the original and non-recurring cost. That would be

the bill. Here it is. \$1.3 million annually. I do not think that any of us tried to go into detail to ascertain what the \$1.3 million goes for, but I would assume maintenance, the payment of personnel, and the normal administrative costs that are associated with such a venture.

I would think—hopefully—that the procurement cost could be handled by taking an island or part of an island that the Government already has; and that is the indication that I have.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Well, I thank the chairman.

That, basically, answers the question.

Does the witness care to comment further?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, unfortunately, I was not here yesterday and did not hear the Department's testimony, so, I am somewhat in the dark and becoming enlightened as much as you are, Mr. Montgomery.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have no further questions.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Zwach?

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. McMillan, first I would like to ask this question of you:

You do believe, do you not, that the American cattlemen and research have done a terrific job of developing the efficiency and the vitality of the cattle industry in our country?

Mr. McMILLAN. By all means, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. That the consumers have benefited tremendously by this development?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. Secondly, we have exported, exported to other countries, our great know-how and development in these areas?

Mr. McMILLAN. This has happened in the past; it certainly has.

Mr. ZWACH. Now, the idea of this legislation is in reverse, giving us some of the benefits of what some of the other nations are doing which, in a sense, we have not been able to do fully?

Mr. McMILLAN. Because of the limitations on these new germ plasmas coming into the United States, yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. That is really what is involved here?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. It is certainly no condemnation of what the American cattlemen have done in all of these areas?

Mr. McMILLAN. By no means. To the contrary, because here we are attempting to develop even further efficiencies and improvements in cattle production.

Mr. ZWACH. What is the name of your national publication?

Mr. McMILLAN. "American Beef Producer."

Mr. ZWACH. You wrote an editorial in the last issue of that paper regarding beef and beef importation and the little slip that is put on every menu with regard to a 75-cent plate increase because of the high cost of beef.

Mr. McMILLAN. This was an editorial written by our president, Bill House; yes, sir.

Mr. ZWACH. I want to commend you for that editorial because it hits the nail right on the head.

By the way, I hope to insert that into the Congressional Record so that several hundred thousand people may see that editorial. I think it indicates that it is foreigners who are, in a sense, forming the policy and the thinking with regard to our industry in this country.

Mr. McMILLAN. Your comments are very much appreciated, Mr. Zwach. I will certainly convey that word to our president. I know he will be delighted as well.

Mr. ZWACH. Well, I think it is a very commendable article. I just had a letter from one of my alert constituents who went to a hotel in Minneapolis, in one of the fine restaurants, and there was that clip-on slip, and so she called the manager, and asked: "Why do you put this on and blame beef for all of your increase in costs?"

"Well," he said, "this came in from somewhere in the East."

So, you see, that dovetails with the editorial that you have written.

Mr. McMILLAN. It does. I can assure you that we were pretty upset about the menu clip-ons. We have written a number of letters to such people as the Hilton and the Sheraton chains and others who were doing nothing more than just spotlighting the fact that beef prices had risen.

We asked them the question:

"When you have labor cost increases, do you spotlight it by a similar menu clip-on?" Obviously, we got a negative reply.

We resented these clip-ons, so your comments are deeply appreciated, Mr. Zwach.

Mr. ZWACH. You state that there are sort of open invitations to violate the quarantine laws through the present Canadian indirect set-up.

Do you know of any violations of the quarantine law?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir; we do not. We do know that with the demand for the new germ plasm, we do not have the facilities, and if there is not sufficient volume permitted through the Canadian system, this, very possibly, could open the door to violations. This is what we want to prevent.

Mr. ZWACH. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Melcher, do you have questions?

Mr. MELCHER. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, but I want to compliment Bill McMillan and the American National Cattlemen's Association for his excellent and constructive testimony. I might say for myself that I do not think we can ever afford to just stand still in the beef industry. We have to keep up with the times. At the same time, we must safeguard ourselves against hoof-and-mouth and rinderpest and other diseases that we do not have here in the United States. We want to make darn sure that we never do have.

I think the testimony is excellent, and I am glad to have had Mr. McMillan with us this morning.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Melcher.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Sebelius?

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMillan, I do not receive your magazine that Brother Zwach just referred to here. Will you be kind enough to tell Bill House that his Kansas member of the Agriculture Committee would like to subscribe to it and be glad to pay for it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Sebelius, we will see that you begin to receive it, compliments of the Association.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Thank you.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. McMillan, to touch on what I think is a related problem—the exporting of animals—I feel that we have not put enough importance on the development of knowledge and the way to control or eliminate blue tongue, and other diseases that damage U.S. exports.

Would it be your feeling that we should continue research, development, whatever is required, to learn more about some of the diseases we have, in order that we can begin more effectively to export breeding cattle to other countries?

Mr. McMILLAN. I concur 100 per cent with you, Mr. Chairman. You mention the disease, blue tongue, and that is probably the principal disease which does limit the exportation of breeding stock from the United States to countries such as New Zealand or Australia and makes for severe limitations to even some of the South American countries such as Brazil.

It so happens that the Blue Tongue Laboratory is located in Denver. We have rather frequent contact with the personnel that man this very important station. It is inadequately staffed, and there is inadequate room to really carry out the right kind of research to find solutions to blue tongue problems. We have been in support of the Department of Agriculture in attempting to get additional appropriations so that this research can be stepped up.

Mr. PURCELL. Well, I had in mind asking you if we could solicit your organization's support, maybe, in helping this committee in getting more importance placed on it, but maybe I had better reverse that and say that we would like to help you get more importance placed on this work, and, maybe, working together in the future—not that we have not been working together, but bearing down more—pointing out the importance of it, possibly getting more funding, or more of whatever might be needed. All of this would be very difficult but I appreciate your comments very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PURCELL. Are there any other questions or comments?

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, we have Mr. McMillan and we have Dr. Melcher.

I wonder if we could have a capsule statement of what blue tongue is?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, I would think that Dr. Melcher would be much better qualified than I.

Mr. PURCELL. I was hoping that Mr. McMillan might try and we would just see how much he does know.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will try. Basically, it is a disease of sheep and the terminology, "blue tongue", the result is just about that way. The mouth area, the tongue, the lips, and so forth, become extremely irritated, and they are unable to eat and become quite gaunt. In some cases they do not get enough to eat and die. Until recently, it has been thought that cattle were only carriers of blue tongue, but this laboratory in Denver to which I referred has shown that cattle themselves can contract the disease, although they are not nearly as susceptible as sheep.

Now, with that lay approach to things, perhaps, Dr. Melcher would wish to expand.

Mr. ZWACH. Are we making headway on it?

Are we getting equipped?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, the problem is, Mr. Zwach, that there has been insufficient funds to go ahead in the research to the extent we feel is necessary to get the disease whipped.

Mr. MELCHER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that Bill has done a good job in explaining the relationship between sheep and cattle. We do not recognize blue tongue as much of a health threat, in this country, to cattle. However, it is necessary to have more research on it, because we do not know the interplay between sheep and cattle in the disease. We are skeptical; we are suspicious, I probably should say, that under certain circumstances it could be a threat to cattle. I happened to be involved as a practicing veterinarian in the operation with blue tongue of sheep in Carter County in Montana about 10 or 12 years ago. There is a vaccine available for sheep, and we used it extensively at that time, and it can bring the outbreak under control quite quickly. The most damaging thing that happened to the people in that area of Montana at that time was due to it being highly contagious. There were a lot of the animals that became sick at one time because of its rapid spread. Very few died. Some did, but because of so many of the flock being sick at one time, it was most damaging because of loss of weight and loss of ability to sell the lambs for breeding use, or for whatever purpose you would want to sell them, at that particular time.

Mr. ZWACH. Doctor, if the blue tongue cattle are shipped into, say, Australia, are they a threat to the sheep industry in Australia?

Mr. MELCHER. We are not sure.

Mr. ZWACH. I see.

Mr. MELCHER. I am not sure, anyway; and I do not think that anybody is too sure, except there is some interplay, and we do not realize the extent of the interplay.

Mr. McMILLAN. However, on that very point, the Australians do maintain an embargo against breeding cattle going into Australia.

Mr. ZWACH. Because of this reason?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; because of the fear that blue tongue could be carried there.

Mr. PURCELL. Let me just add that the sheep industry being so terribly important to Australia and to New Zealand, they have taken the same attitude toward this disease as we have toward foot-and-mouth disease, and rather than to flirt with the possibility, they have placed an absolute embargo. Therefore we are not at this time sending any breeding cattle in there. They are badly in need of hundreds or thousands, apparently, of the kind of breeding cattle that we can furnish.

Mr. ZWACH. I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this out.

Mr. PURCELL. We just need to do something. And our scientists do not know, of course, at this point, what to do. We have gotten some cattle into Brazil, and they have accepted, as a rule, that cattle coming from east of the Mississippi they will take under some circumstances, but it is a danger, and this is a flimsy way to go at it, because we have no way of knowing whether the cattle are coming from west of the Mississippi before they are shipped.

I have no further comments on that.

Mr. MELCHER. I might add this one more point, Mr. Chairman: Our cattle would do a great deal to the improvement of Australia's cattle.

We have much more advanced beef cattle than they have, and there should be a widespread demand over there for breeding cattle from our country. But, however, we are prevented from doing that on this basis.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Jones, do you have any comments?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. No, sir.

(The subcommittee also received for the record the following statement, letters, and telegram:)

STATEMENT OF HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11832 is a bill in which my constituents in the Fourth District of Florida are most interested. This section of Florida, where livestock farms abound, is extremely anxious to upgrade its stock of beef and introduce new breeds of horses.

For many years we have had restrictions on importing additional breeds of animals for improving the stock. The United States has a very limited genetic base of livestock and needs to broaden this base to gain increased growth and production efficiency.

Now, under provisions of this proposed bill, quarantine safeguards are included which will make the importations safe insofar as spreading animal diseases and feasible when one considers the potential benefit to the market.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of making this statement in behalf of H.R. 11832 and I am hopeful the Committee will consider this bill favorably.

Castroville, Tex., October 18, 1969.

Hon. W. R. POAGE,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POAGE: As cattle breeders and individuals dependent upon progressive cattle improvement for our income we would like to state our reasons for desiring the importation of Simmental cattle or a corollary breed (theoretically the same breed with a different name in various countries) from Switzerland, West Germany, or France.

As the emphasis on beef cattle improvement shifts towards faster, more efficient gains, better cut-out value with more lean meat and less fat per unit of production, U.S. beef breeders are taking dead aim on the factors that contribute towards these goals. These factors are recognized as: 1) superior muscling qualities and beef conformation, 2) mother cows with high milk production, 3) good fertility in bulls and cows, 4) inherent factors for rapid growth, 5) consolidated hereditary characteristics that give the hybrid vigor so necessary for modern economic cross-breeding.

The importance of performance and production records have been generally recognized for a number of years. However, the mass of beef producers in this country have been slow to accept and adopt meaningful record keeping systems as a part of their operations. Therefore, the percentage of cattle in the U.S. that are thoroughly performance or production tested are in a serious minority as far as being a factor for rapidly influencing the improvement of the considerable number of U.S. cattle herds.

In Europe, because land values are very high, each animal kept as a brood cow or herd sire *must produce*. Consequently, the Swiss and W. German breeders have established programs and standards that assist them in finding the top animals for herd replacements. A program has been in effect for over 60 years in which only those cattle meeting certain standards of production and points of conformation are eligible for registration.

This rigid selection in the Simmental cattle, Europe's most numerous breed, places them in a prominent position among the world's cattle population.

The combination of high milk production (in Europe the Simmental is also used for dairy purposes) in a beef animal is seemingly an answer to the cross-breeding dreams of U.S. cattlemen who have long felt the need for increased milk production, while maintaining rapid growth rates in their commercial beef programs.

The systematic improvement of the Simmental breed, based on proven and consolidated lines, and on careful individual selection for type and productivity, has made it possible to reach a high degree of uniformity and security in the transmission of hereditary characteristics.

The consolidation of these hereditary characteristics practically guarantees the transmission of these inherent abilities in a prepotent way. For this reason, the breed is chosen in many regions of the world for crossbreeding programs.

Unquestionably, Simmental crossbred cows, regardless of the percentage of blood, are going to contribute immeasurably to the beef industry of the United States.

At the present time however, the only way U.S. breeders can obtain this new genetic material is through artificial insemination with semen collected from the few Simmental bulls that have been imported into Canada. This is a slow and somewhat ineffective way to bring about the much needed benefit our cattle herds need. Also, there has been some question regarding the discretion used in selection by the importers of bulls now in Canada.

European countries are annually importing numerous quantities of livestock from the United States with, what they feel, is a possible danger of re-introducing Bangs and T.B. into their countries. They feel that there should be some type of reciprocal program in which they could export to the U.S.

Certainly, we do not want to endanger our herds to Hoof and Mouth Disease, but it is our feeling that a concentrated effort is needed on the part of our government to work out a program in which adequate quarantine procedures could be established to safely allow entry of Simmental cattle and other European breeds into the United States.

It is our understanding that we are presently restricted by an antiquated 1930 law. We feel that it is time that this law is either revised or amended so that the problem may be approached in a workable manner.

Canada and its citizens have reaped a multi-million dollar dividend from U.S. livestock producers in the past three years by allowing liberal importations and by setting up adequate quarantine stations. In addition, by restricting the subsequent exportation of female cattle into the U.S., they have captured many American dollars as U.S. cattlemen have established ranches in Canada, have purchased vast quantities of bull semen from Canadian sources, and have purchased many cattle contributing to Canadian profits.

In view of the foregoing, we urge you to take an interest and give support to the liberalization of American importation laws and/or the setting up of quarantine stations in which healthy animals may be cleared for importation. We believe that this matter is of prime importance to the future economy of a large segment of our American beef industry.

Sincerely,

M. W. SHARP, D.V.M.

FITZHUGH-STRAUS MEDINA HEREFORD RANCH,
San Antonio, Tex., October 23, 1969.

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL,
House Agriculture Committee,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PURCELL: In view of the importance of the Twenty Billion Dollar beef cattle production in the United States, we wholeheartedly endorse the proposed establishment of a livestock quarantine station off the coast of the United States. It is also our opinion that the quarantine law of 1930 should be amended, or revised, to make it more flexible, whereby it would permit the breeders of the United States to import improved breeds of beef cattle, or livestock, into the United States.

We ranchers realize that we have enjoyed a gradual increase in demand for our products. We also anticipate this demand will continue for years to come. It is estimated that this year in the United States, our capital consumption of beef will be from 108 to 110 pounds per person. With our population increasing each year, not only in the United States, but entire world, we are going to witness a gradual increasing demand for our beef.

We do not have any more land available for cattle production, therefore, we must perfect ways and means whereby we can produce more beef per acre than we are now producing. This will necessitate a more efficient production. Expe-

rience and experimental station data has proved that one of the best and most efficient ways to increase beef production is by crossbreeding. It has been proved, without doubt, when we cross two or more superior breeds, one will increase his beef cattle production ten to twenty per cent annually. Beef cattle producers in the United States today are making many changes in their operations so they can meet present day competition.

More emphasis is being placed today on breeding beef cattle that will produce more red meat and less fat and, also an animal, who will make a faster and more efficient gain. We are striving to select breeding herds that will possess the following breeding traits:

- (1) Inherit factors for rapid growth ;
- (2) Superior fertility among bulls and cows ;
- (3) Select cattle with outstanding beef conformation that will possess superior muscling qualities ; and
- (4) Cows with higher milk production.

All of these factors are very important.

It has been our observation that there are several superior breeds of beef cattle, or dual purpose cattle, in Europe that would certainly be highly important to our crossbreeding program in the United States. But the breeders in the United States are certainly at a disadvantage today since it is impossible for us to import these cattle to the United States. The only place we can get these cattle, and that is semen only, is through Canada. Canada is receiving many millions of dollars each year from breeders of the United States for semen and, also, many millions of United States Dollars have been invested in Canada for ranch land where they can produce cattle from European countries.

We sincerely urge that you support a change in our American Import Law of 1930, giving discretionary power to the Department of Agriculture and, also, the establishment of an adequate quarantine station.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. FITZHUGH.
J. R. STRAUS, Sr.

AMERICAN YORKSHIRE CLUB, INC.,
Lafayette, Ind., November 14, 1969.

Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PURCELL: Thanks for your letter of the 6th of November in regard to the hearings on your quarantine bill which are scheduled for November 18th and 19th. I am sorry for the delay in answering but I just returned last evening the 13th from a trip to England, Scotland, Germany and Holland where I visited several livestock shows and several universities in regard to swine research work.

I regret very much that my schedule is filled up until after the 19th, but if there is any postponement on this hearing I would appreciate being advised and maybe I can fit it into my schedule. I am taking the liberty to make some statements in support of your bill H.B. 11832.

There are individuals in many breeds of livestock and species in the world, if used in the breeding programs of our breeds of livestock, they could be a tremendous help in improving breeds of livestock in the United States.

Relatively few animals of any breed contribute to breed improvement, but it is very necessary that when you find the right one to be able to use it to help improve foundation breeding stock. Purebred breeders do a lot of line breeding and inbreeding to help improve their uniformity and standardize conformation and production of animals. However, in time a suitable outcross becomes necessary to offset some of the unfavorable things that breeders run into in too much line breeding and inbreeding. Weaknesses and some heritable defects crop up after a intensive program of inbreeding or line breeding is used in many cases. Here again is where a outcross is very helpful.

Canada and other countries are using quarantine stations to help them improve their livestock. There is no reason why the United States should be behind these other countries. H.R. 11832 would help U.S.A. livestock breeders keep pace with its competition.

I appreciate the desire of our U.S.D.A. people to stay away from livestock diseases, but some of these countries such as Canada have had less livestock

disease than we, and have been far more aggressive in their breeding program through quarantine stations than we in this country.

Recently, several breeds of cattle have been introduced and others improved in the United States, but these breeds could have done a better job had we had our own quarantine stations. There are superior lines of breeds still available in many places in the world that have not been brought in as yet.

The swine industry and sheep breeders have not been able to compete on the same basis with cattle people because of the lack of a blood test being developed for these two species to check against for the possibility of foot and mouth. The people in the division of animal health should have been looking further ahead and given the sheep and swine people the same opportunity that has been afforded the cattle breeders. I understand that they are working on it at the present time, but it is hard to tell when a test will be available. This has certainly put the swine and sheep breeder at a disadvantage with this competition in the production of red meats.

The board of directors of the American Yorkshire Club and its members wholeheartedly support H. R. 11832 and hope that this bill receives a favorable recommendation from the committee hearings. It could be a progressive step in helping breed better livestock in the United States.

You are quite right that a quarantine station would have helped a great deal in our problem with the boar and sow in Canada from Scotland. This boar and sow can go anywhere in Canada today. Canada was free of hog cholera long before us, and has had less livestock disease than we. The department has maintained that Scotland is a part of Great Britain. They have not had any foot and mouth in Scotland and the Canadian Government recognizes this fact. Our livestock authorities have been aware of this past record as well as I, or Canada.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR PLAGER.

P.S.—I will be at a meeting on Tuesday evening the 18th, at Toronto, Canada, and might be possible for me to fly to Washington D.C., for the 19th.

W. L. P.

SALEM, OREG., *November 17, 1969.*

Hon. GRAHAM PURCELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Supervised import facilities urgently needed. Maintain vitality U.S. purebred industry. Adopt H.R. 11832.

OREGON SHEEP ADVISORY COUNCIL,
DOUG SCHAMBERS, *Chairman.*

Mr. PURCELL. If there is nothing further, we thank you very much, Mr. McMillan, and we will excuse you; and the subcommittee will go into executive session.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the subcommittee retired into executive session.)





Revised 7/17/70

INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
AND GENERAL LEGISLATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 2306

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION AND TO PERMIT THE ENTRY THEREIN OF ANIMALS FROM ANY COUNTRY AND THE SUBSEQUENT MOVEMENT OF SUCH ANIMALS INTO OTHER PARTS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF IMPROVING LIVESTOCK BREEDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

DECEMBER 8, 1969

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1969

5 Mulh...

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana, *Chairman*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina

GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota

JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

JACK MILLER, Iowa

CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska

ROBERT J. DOLE, Kansas

HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

COTYS M. MOUSER, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND GENERAL LEGISLATION

B. EVERETT JORDAN, North Carolina, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska

ROBERT J. DOLE, Kansas

(II)

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Arnold, Edward M., Arnold Cattle Co., Nenzel, Nebr.....	7
Bledsoe, Robert P., executive secretary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Casper, Wyo.....	7
Clarkson, Dr. M. R., executive vice president, American Veterinary Medical Association.....	32
Dole, Hon. Robert J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas.....	26
Fitzhugh, H. A., Fitzhugh-Straus Medina Hereford Ranch, San Antonio, Tex.....	25
Hansen, Hon. Clifford P., a U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming.....	27
Hruska, Hon. Roman L., a U.S. Senator from the State of Nebraska.....	4
Jordan, Hon. Len B., a U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho.....	28
Kottman, Roy M., dean and director, College of Agriculture and Home Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.....	9
McMillan, C. W., executive vice president, American National Cattle-men's Association, Denver, Colo.....	16
Magdanz, Don F., executive secretary-treasurer, National Livestock Feeders Association, Omaha, Nebr.....	33
Marsh, Edwin E., executive secretary, National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.....	11
Muthern, Dr. Francis J., Deputy Administrator for Regulatory and Control Programs, Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.....	12
Ottoson, Howard W., director and associate dean, College of Agriculture and Home Economics, University of Nebraska.....	8
Paddock, Clayton S., president, American-International Charolais Association, Houston, Tex.....	8
Petersen, Vic, Walnut, Iowa.....	9
Plager, Wilbur L., secretary-treasurer, American Yorkshire Club, Lafayette, Ind.....	9
Purdy, Robert H., president, North American Limousin Foundation, Buffalo, Wyo.....	29
Sharp, Dr. M. W., Castroville, Tex.....	24
Stewart, Mickey, executive secretary, Washington Cattlemen's Association, Ellensburg, Wash.....	10
Straus, Joe R. Jr., Fitzhugh-Straus Medina Hereford Ranch, San Antonio, Tex.....	18
Walton, Robert E., president, American Breeders Service, DeForest, Wis.....	10
Wilson, E. H., executive vice president, Alabama Cattlemen's Association, Montgomery, Ala.....	11
Winter, Winton A., State senator, Sixth District, Topeka, Kans.....	7
Miscellaneous documents:	
S. 2306, 91st Congress.....	1
Report from the Department of Agriculture.....	2

三三三

INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1969

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND
GENERAL LEGISLATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 324, Old Senate Office Building, Senator B. Everett Jordan of North Carolina (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jordan of North Carolina and Bellmon.

Senator JORDAN. The subcommittee will please come to order.

The subcommittee is holding hearings today on S. 2306. This bill provides for the establishment of an international quarantine station, and the movement through it into the United States of animals which might otherwise be excluded by the animal quarantine laws. Such movement could be made only under conditions adequate to prevent introduction of disease into the United States, and the Department of Agriculture advises that it regards such prevention as its prime responsibility. The bill would make it possible to bring in breeding stock to improve the U.S. livestock industry.

The station would be located on an island within U.S. territory. The Secretary would be authorized to acquire land by purchase, donation, or otherwise, to construct necessary improvements, and to charge user fees. The Department of Agriculture recommends enactment with an amendment authorizing the Secretary to accept donations of money, personal property, buildings, and other facilities for the purpose of carrying out the act.

Copies of the bill and the Department's report will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The documents follow:)

[S. 2306, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. Notwithstanding the pro-

visions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including, but not limited to, those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington D.C., November 12, 1969.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of June 26, 1969 requesting a report on S. 2306. The bill is entitled "To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes."

The bill would authorize the Secretary to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States, and permit, under appropriate safeguards, the movement of animals into the United States otherwise prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws. The quarantine station would be located on an island selected by the Secretary on the basis that it would permit the maintenance of maximum animal disease and pest security measures. Under the bill, movements to the quarantine station or to other parts of the United States would be prohibited unless made in accordance with conditions prescribed in regulations of this Department as adequate to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign countries.

This Department recommends enactment of S. 2306, if amended as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the "period" add the following sentence:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act."

A more detailed statement in support of this position is attached.

Enactment of the bill would necessitate additional appropriations. The exact location of an island suitable for establishment of the proposed international quarantine station would heavily influence the construction costs. Another influencing factor could be whether or not any costs would be involved for land acquisition. The best approximation, at this time, is that approximately \$2.5 million would be needed on a non-recurring basis for the construction of the facilities. The total operating and maintenance expenses for the quarantine station would be approximately \$1.3 million annually. It is anticipated that these costs would be financed largely through the collection of fees from importers for the use of the facilities. The fee would include costs for the care, feed, and handling of animals during the period of quarantine as well as other costs

incident to the quarantine of animals; e.g., fences, equipment, utilities, supplies and materials to the extent they are not covered by appropriations.

There would be no expenditure of funds for this purpose prior to fiscal year 1971.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL, *Acting Secretary.*

USDA POSITION IN SUPPORT OF S. 2306

The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1306) contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of all ruminants and swine (except wild zoo animals) and fresh, chilled or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by this Department to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. Under very stringent restrictions, including authority for permanent post-entry quarantine, wild ruminants and swine may be permitted entry under the Act when such animals are solely for exhibition at an approved zoological park from which they cannot be moved except to another approved zoological park.

Provisions in the Act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111) and the Act of July 2, 1962 (21 U.S.C. 134 *et seq.*) provide additional authority and responsibility for prohibiting or restricting importation of animals, meat, and other articles in order to prevent the introduction or dissemination of foot-and-mouth disease and other destructive livestock or poultry diseases and pests such as African swine fever, exotic ticks, African horse sickness, and fowl pest.

These statutes are implemented by extensive and strict regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 9, Parts 92, 94, 95, and 96. These regulations apply to the importation of animals, meats, animal by-products and materials such as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease exists. The regulations are based on the best scientific information available, including the research being done at our Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, Long Island, New York.

Our primary responsibility is and will continue to be the prevention of livestock and poultry diseases and pests gaining entry from foreign countries. At the same time we recognize that there are breeds and types of foreign livestock with the potential of bringing about specific desired improvements more rapidly in U.S. livestock production than can be accomplished with domestic breeds. Research activities have demonstrated the high potential of cross-breeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in livestock production. Cross-breeding can bring about changes in the character and composition of the product more rapidly than any other breeding procedure. It has been further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in cross-breeding, the greater benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics. For instance, the introduction into the United States of exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal new varieties of high yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in every-day use on farms and ranches.

The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals are expected to be similar to those experienced in crop production. Some of the improvements in livestock production would include:

(a) *Beef cattle*.—an increase in weaning, post-weaning growth rates, and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival.

(b) *Dairy cattle*.—an increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival.

(c) *Sheep*.—an increase in lambing rate, lamb growth rate and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat.

(d) *Swine*.—an increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

In spite of the benefits to be derived, the importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries must not be done at the risk of introducing diseases and pests not now present in this country which would greatly reduce livestock production. We believe that both objectives can be obtained only by the establishment of an international animal quarantine station. The establishment

and operation of such a station would have to be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture. It would involve selection of an island site where maximum disease security measures could be utilized.

Senator JORDAN. Senator Hruska, we are delighted to have you here this morning.

May I say in the beginning, I am delighted that you introduced this piece of legislation, because I think it is past due, and it ought to be enacted. You may proceed as you wish, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wish to submit a prepared statement and also make a few brief remarks.

We are grateful Mr. Chairman, for your calling this hearing and getting this bill started on its way in the Senate. Hearings were held in the House recently and I understand that the House subcommittee has reported it.

Our livestock industry faces a great challenge—increasing its productivity on less land to meet a greater market in the future.

One means of meeting this challenge is through crossbreeding to achieve the benefits of hybrid vigor. However, it is felt by many experts that new foreign breeds are needed to more rapidly promote the productivity benefits of crossbreeding. Many of these desired breeds are not now available, Mr. Chairman, because of our livestock import restrictions.

I believe that the evidence of this hearing will show that the present policy is not satisfactory. I believe that by passing this bill we can achieve a safe method of importing foreign breeds which will be inexpensive, efficient, and operated under the highest standards of disease detection. This method is through the establishment of an international livestock quarantine station under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The details are discussed more fully in my statement. We have strong support in this approach from the national livestock organizations. Quite a number of letters have reached me, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that those letters be submitted for your record, because they are very representative, Mr. Chairman. They indicate wide support.

Senator JORDAN. They will be placed in the record following your remarks.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Chairman, there will be at least two outside witnesses here this morning. Mr. Bill McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, is well versed in this field. I had also hoped that Don Magdanz of the National Livestock Feeders Association would come. He was not able to accommodate his schedule, but he is sending his statement for the record.

Senator JORDAN. It will be included in the record.

Senator HRUSKA. And then we have a member of a cattle family from San Antonio, Tex., Mr. Chairman. Mr. Joe Strans will describe his operation, and he will describe the attitude of cattlemen in his

area and of his acquaintances toward a U.S. animal quarantine station.

I might tell you that the Straus herd was originated and founded some 75 to 100 years ago. So Joe Straus comes from a background that makes him very competent. His appearance here today at his own time and his own expense is greatly appreciated.

(Senator Hruska's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee on S. 2306, a bill I introduced entitled the International Livestock Quarantine Station Act.

The bill would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the movement of animals into the United States which would otherwise be prohibited. In order to enter, these animals would first have to pass through a rigorous inspection and quarantine procedure.

To accomplish this, the bill would authorize the Department of Agriculture to establish and operate an international quarantine station within the territory of the United States. Most likely, the station would be located on an island in the Caribbean. Livestock to be imported from countries afflicted with foot-and-mouth disease would be quarantined at this station from a reasonable period of time, and be subjected to the highest standards and most advanced techniques of disease-detection.

Mr. Chairman, many livestock producers and organizations have written to me expressing their strong support for S. 2306. With your permission, I would like to submit some of these letters to the record to be included at the end of my testimony.

Besides the support of the livestock producers and organizations, I am informed that the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Treasury, and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection. This is welcome news and encouragement.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that a compelling case must be made that this legislation is needed. I would like to make a few comments on that need.

Our livestock industry is the most efficient and productive in the world. It provides our growing population with an ample supply of wholesome and inexpensive meat and dairy products, and provides numerous allied industries with the basic supplies for their ultimate products. Cash receipts from the sale of meat animals in the first six months of 1969 amounted to \$13.4 billion of the \$20.5 billion produced by the entire farm factor.

A challenge however faces the growth of this industry. It is critical to the industry's future productivity and the price of its products. This challenge is providing a greater quantity of produce on smaller amounts of land.

Seeking to meet this challenge, the livestock industry has become vitally concerned with "hybrid vigor" which is the description used for the benefits of new germ plasm for breeding stock. Hybrid vigor can improve productivity, improve the survival rate, promote more rapid growth of the animals, and improve the feed conversion rate.

This interest in new bloodlines has directed the attention of the livestock industry to new and different breeds from foreign countries. Importing certain new breeds is presently impossible, however, due to the threat of foot-and-mouth disease. The United States has been free of the disease since 1929, and the prohibition in the Tariff Act of 1930 was enacted to prevent a recurrence. On the other hand, inspection, test, and quarantine techniques have been greatly improved since then, so that complete protection is now possible using those techniques on each animal. Other countries of the world, notably Canada, have constructed and operated quarantine stations to prevent importation of diseased livestock, and such stations have been wholly effective.

In fact, United States livestock interests were able for a time to purchase livestock in afflicted countries and import them to the United States by passing them through the quarantine facilities in Canada. Since Canada is considered disease-free, the livestock could promptly be imported into the United States once they had entered Canada.

Requiring very thorough, extensive and elaborate controls on livestock coming from afflicted countries, such as France, and then requiring a period of strict

quarantine and testing at two stations, one at Grosse Ile and one at St. John's, the Canadian Government has been able to exclude completely any animal carrying foot-and-mouth disease from ever being released from the centers.

However, for a number of reasons, this arrangement is no longer as satisfactory as it once was. First, it has been estimated to cost the American importer at least \$5,000 per head for use of the Canadian quarantine procedures. This makes the cost of new bloodlines prohibitory. More important, however, is that fact that the United States has no control over the apparatus of importation and quarantine. In order to minimize this risk, the Department of Agriculture sends American veterinarians to meet livestock shipments to Canada from afflicted foreign countries where the livestock are intended for ultimate import into the United States. This has proved to be burdensome and expensive.

It now appears that other countries, such as Japan and Ireland, which are considered disease-free under the Tariff Act, are considering establishing similar quarantine stations to export livestock from afflicted countries into the United States. Of course, more American veterinarians would have to be sent abroad to supervise shipments from those stations, just as is done in Canada.

The more disease-free countries that seek to do this, the greater the expense to the American Government, the more difficult it is to supervise the increasingly diverse systems of quarantine control of these many countries, and the greater the risk that a diseased animal will reach our shores.

For these reasons, it is eminently proper for us to direct our efforts toward establishing a livestock quarantine station here in the United States as the most safe and least expensive means of supervising the importation of new livestock breeds from afflicted countries.

At the same time, of course, the American station could supervise the importation of a far greater number of exotic livestock than could any other station.

The benefits of these new breeds would be great, and the greater the number the more immediate would be those benefits to the livestock industry and to the consumer. For example, it has been estimated that if the cattle industry is to meet consumer demand in the year 2000, that the industry will have to produce calves that will have a weaning weight of around 600 to 700 pounds. The weaning weight of calves today is normally around 300 to 400 pounds. Only extensive crossbreeding can probably accomplish this. The results would be more rapid growth of livestock and earlier marketing.

The use of certain foreign stock not now available is thought by some experts to be the most likely means of bringing about the many desirable changes faster than can the process of selection within present United States breeds.

The costs of an American quarantine station would be very reasonable, I am told, compared to the possible benefits. On the basis of available information, it has been estimated that the annual benefits to the livestock producers and the public could amount to from \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion after 1980.

In addition, it is expected that expenses for operating the quarantine station would be financed largely from the collection of fees from American importers.

While seeking to achieve the benefits that can be derived from an adequate number of exotic livestock, the Department of Agriculture's primary responsibility under the bill would continue to be the prevention of livestock and poultry diseases from entering the United States.

Both of these objectives can, I believe, be achieved by establishing a United States international livestock quarantine station under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture. This is the purpose of S. 2306.

Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of this bill. Thank you.

Senator HRUSKA. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will move on to a meeting of the Judiciary Committee which convenes very shortly and leave you to the tender mercies of Mr. Mulhern and these other two witnesses.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you. I appreciate it very much. Your letters will be included in the record. I want to thank you for introducing this bill. It is late. It should have been done a long time ago.

(The letters referred to above are as follows:)

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 26, 1969.*

Hon. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Many Kansas cattlemen including faculty members in the Department of Animal Science & Industries at Kansas State University are very much interested in the importation of breeds which do not now exist in the United States.

R. E. Omohundro, Acting Director of the Animal Health Division of the USDA, has sent me a copy of S. 2306 which you authored. We would like to be of assistance in any way possible in effecting passage of this measure.

I would appreciate it if you would advise me from time to time relative to the progress of S. 2306 and similar bills.

Very truly yours,

WINTON A. WINTER,
State Senator, Sixth District.

NENZEL, NEBR., *June 23, 1969.*

Senator ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We surely commend you on your introduction of Bill S. 2306, and hope that your efforts for the livestock industry will meet with success.

You are evidently more than familiar with ranching problems today. We have discarded generations of effort in our breeding programs, changing from straight Hereford and Angus to cross-breeds. We are now finding that the imported French cattle Charolais and Limousin, can give us some of the answers where change is necessarily slow. We can't simply "retool" as in factories, and your proposed quarantine station would give access to genetic possibilities for our business, which would be invaluable.

I am a charter member of the North American Limousin Foundation, a group interested in building up the Limousin breed in this country, and we feel that we have found an animal which will gain and grow faster, with "marbling" qualities superior to anything we have been able to develop.

We have a real stake in this potential improvement for our herds, and appreciate your efforts. We have written to our Senators and congressman, and will do all we can to help with passage of this bill.

Yours truly,

EDWARD M. ARNOLD,
Arnold Cattle Co.

CASPER, WYO., *June 26, 1969.*

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: We appreciate very much your letter of June 16th in which you enclosed copies of the statements you made on the Senate floor in support of your bill S. 2306, the International Livestock Quarantine Station Act. We feel that this is good legislation for the domestic livestock industry and certainly hope that it becomes a law.

We have also prepared a brief article regarding this legislation for our monthly publication, the WYOMING WOOL GROWER.

Again, we certainly appreciate your sponsorship of this legislation and if there is anything that we can do to help it become enacted into law, please do not hesitate to let us know. Thanks again for calling this to our attention.

Best regards.

Very truly yours,

WYOMING WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT P. BLEDSOE,
Executive Secretary.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
LINCOLN, NEBR., August 20, 1969.

Hon. Senator ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to express our appreciation for your introduction of S. 2306, a bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station which would permit the entry of animals from other countries for the purpose of improving livestock breeds, in the Senate on June 5, 1969.

Our livestock breeders have long been frustrated by their lack of access to germ plasm in breeds of livestock outside the U.S. This proposed quarantine facility will make it possible for us to have access to germ plasm all over the world. Such access will speed up our breeding programs and certainly have the potential of important economic pay-off in terms of more efficient livestock production in the long run.

We are very happy that you saw fit to introduce this important proposal as a Senate bill.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD W. OTTOSON,
Director and Associate Dean.

HOUSTON, TEX., December 8, 1969.

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: The American-International Charolais Association, the world's fourth largest beef cattle breed with more than 9,000 members, wholeheartedly supports your SB 2306 to "provide for the establishment of an offshore international quarantine station and to permit the entry of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes."

This Association for many years has urged the establishment of such a station, and reaffirmed its support and encouragement for such a station at meetings of its board of directors in Kansas City, Missouri, October 17, 1969, and at San Antonio, Texas, February 10, 1969.

Financing of the station *could* be obtained through private subscriptions. Operation of such facility would be on a self-sustaining fee basis, for all practical purposes eliminating government expenditures. Quotas could be established for each breed utilizing the facility.

The annual benefits of such a station to the United States Beef Industry was estimated at \$1 to \$1.5 billion annually in a special study recently made by Dr. R. E. Hodson, director of the Animal Husbandry Division, Agriculture Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, titled "Importation and Evaluation of Exotic Germ Plasm to improve Livestock." We refer you to this.

This new sperm plasm would widen the genetic base of some classes of livestock now being developed in the United States from an extremely narrow genetic base. Science has demonstrated high potential of crossbreeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in production.

Science has further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossbreeding, the greater the benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and the product characteristics.

The report further emphasizes that the use of certain exotic (imported) breeds of livestock can bring about desirable changes in production technologies much faster than the same changes could be achieved within present U.S. breeds through long years of selection.

Your approval of this bill in committee and your active support in obtaining its passage by the Senate is greatly needed for further expansion of the American Beef Industry, and is urged by this Association. If this Association can be of any assistance in the implementation of this bill, please let us know.

Sincerely,

CLAYTON S. PADDOCK, *President,*
American-International Charolais Association.

WALNUT, IOWA, *July 23, 1969.*

HON. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: I would like to say thank you for introducing the bill S. 2306 in the U.S. Senate to provide an animal quarantine station.

I am real sure that this would be beneficial to all of us here in the U.S. Of course we as a cattle breeder have a selfish interest, but as we look to the future, I am sure it will help us to produce a larger quantity and the quality of meat that will be required in the years to come.

We have had some experience with the imported breeding. We at this time own a one-fourth interest in one of the Charolais bulls that was imported from France through the Canadian quarantine station in 1965. We feel he is a tremendous asset in improving our domestic bred cattle.

However, our chief concern now is will we be able to acquire an interest in another bull of equal or superior quality. I am sure that if you are successful in obtaining the quarantine station, it will improve our chances of obtaining the type of breeding that we need to follow what we now have.

Yours truly,

VIC PETERSEN.

LAFAYETTE, IND., *July 1, 1969.*

Senator R. L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: The American Yorkshire Club is very vitally interested in your Senate Bill 2306 that you have just introduced. I had some information on it from Mr. R. J. Anderson, Acting Administrator of the U.S.D.A. I have traveled all over Continental Europe and have found some Yorkshires which are known as Large Whites in may of the other countries that would help our breed in the states. Because of some diseases we have not been able to take advantage of these blood lines in the breeding of some better hogs. A suitable blood test for swine for Foot and Mouth will need to be developed so we can bring some of these animals into the States. We would be able to widen the genetic base and improve Yorkshires which would, in turn, benefit the whole swine industry and consumer. The Large White breed is not the only breed of swine that could be improved and also other species of livestock.

One of the bottlenecks will be a blood test that I mentioned and the same will probably pertain to the sheep industry. I have made a proposal to the U.S.D.A., Division of Animal Health, of the necessity of developing this type of a test. I do not know, at the present time, if anything has been started but will be checking up on it.

My Board and other Yorkshire breeders would like to have a list of the Senate Committee that will be passing judgement on this bill. Anything that I or any of my Directors or breeders can do in helping this Bill will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR L. PLAGER,
AMERICAN YORKSHIRE CLUB,
Secretary-Treasurer.

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
Columbus, Ohio, July 18, 1969.

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Our nation's agricultural industry owes you a debt of gratitude for your introduction of S. 2306 concerning the establishment of an International Animal Quarantine Station, thus making it possible to import new and useful germ plasma for the improvement of our nation's livestock industry.

As Administrative Adviser to NC-1, Regional Research Project on the Improvement of Beef Cattle Through Breeding Methods, I have long observed the frustration of our animal scientists in knowing of the existence of germ plasma in breeds of livestock outside the United States which, because of Federal regulations and inadequate quarantine facilities, could not be brought into this country.

As you know, our Canadian friends have profited to the extent of many millions of dollars by initiating legislation and organizing a quarantine station appropriate to the needs for bringing in livestock from other parts of the world. Your farsighted leadership in introducing legislation which will enable the United States to capitalize on germ plasma from other lands will make it possible for us to not only compete on favorable terms with the Canadians but more importantly, to exert ourselves more diligently in the research for genetic material which will be of value to our nation's livestock industry.

I speak on behalf of all members of our NC-1 Technical Committee in urging that the legislation which you have introduced be acted upon favorably by the United States Congress.

Again, may I express to you on behalf of our animal scientists involved with animal breeding research, our very great appreciation for your leadership in introducing S. 2306.

Sincerely yours,

ROY M. KOTTMAN,
Dean and Director.

WASHINGTON CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Ellensburg, Wash., August 25, 1969.

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
*U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: The Washington Cattlemen's Association strongly endorses the Senate Bill number 2306 introduced by you.

This bill provides for a quarantine station to be set up, which could greatly facilitate movement of animals into the United States, affording maximum protection against introducing foreign and exotic diseases to both humans and animals in our country.

Sincerely,

MICKEY STEWART,
Executive Secretary.

DE FOREST, WIS., July 3, 1969.

HON. ROMAN HRUSKA,
*U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: We were delighted to learn that you recently introduced S. 2306 to provide for an international livestock quarantine station. The attached copy of my letter to Representative Poage on March 17, 1969, will relate our interest in such a station.

I have just returned from a personal inspection of several of the breeds our Company, which breeds over 1,600,000 cattle each year, has been importing from France and Switzerland with the help of Canadian breeders through the Canadian facilities.

I am all the more convinced of the value these breeds can be to our national livestock industry. By taking aggressive action now, we can indeed make the United States the stud center for the world. But without these breeds, we are seriously handicapped in the race.

Be assured of our support for the bill. We shall be working actively for its passage through letters to our Wisconsin Congressmen as well as through efforts of various livestock associations that share our concern.

Do not hesitate to call on us if we can assist your efforts in any way.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALTON, *President.*
AMERICAN BREEDERS SERVICE.

(The letter referred to above is as follows:)

MARCH 17, 1969.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POAGE: The *establishment of a major U.S. quarantine station* that can safely handle the importation of new breeds of livestock from Europe and other parts of the world is *one of the pressing needs of the livestock industry of the U.S.A.*

The rapid growth and acceptance of the Charolais breed during the past decade through Canadian importations gives dramatic evidence of the need for a different kind of animal than we have had available thus far from British breeds alone. The Simmental and Limousin are now on the scene and are being awaited with open arms by the industry because they, too, offer, larger, faster growing, more efficient animals that will produce the kind of meat the modern housewife desires.

There are over 200 breeds of cattle in Europe and Western Asia that have been sampled in our country. Most of these breeds have nothing new to offer, but several offer great promise. We cannot afford to let our livestock industry fall behind, either in competition with other countries, or in competition with other sources of human food.

At the moment, the importation of these new breeds into the U.S.A. is limited to the dribble that come through the Canadian Station at Gros Isle and eventually are released by the Canadians to cross the border.

As a major livestock producer and as a center of livestock breeding, it is imperative that a U.S. quarantine station be developed as soon as possible so that the best sources of genetic material can be available within the U.S. A revolution is taking place today in the beef industry in which new breeds and crossbreeding are becoming major tools of modern producers.

Your effort on behalf of this pressing need would be of immense service to this great industry.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. WALTON, *President.*

ALABAMA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Montgomery, Ala., June 24, 1969.

SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Thank you very much for your nice letter of June 16, enclosing information on your Bill S. 2306.

The cattlemen of Alabama deeply appreciate the great service you are doing for the cattle industry. Keep up the good work and when we can be of help, please call us.

Sincerely,

E. H. WILSON,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, June 26, 1969.

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: Thank you for your letter of June 16 regarding your recent introduction of S. 2306, the International Livestock Quarantine Station Act.

We feel that the aims of your bill would be of substantial benefit to the livestock industry. We will be happy to include an item in our monthly publication to the effect that you have introduced this bill. If there is anything further we can do to assist in implementing its passage, please let us know.

Your consistent fine support of the domestic sheep industry is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

EDWIN E. MARSH,
Executive Secretary.

Senator JORDAN. Dr. Mulhern, have a seat, sir.

Give your name and all necessary information about yourself for the record and proceed. Please announce who is with you.

STATEMENT OF DR. FRANCIS J. MULHERN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR REGULATORY AND CONTROL PROGRAMS, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Dr. MULHERN. I have with me Dr. E. J. Warwick, the Assistant Director of Animal Husbandry Research Division of the Agricultural Research Service.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the Department of Agriculture's position on S. 2306.

The Department recommends enactment of S. 2306 with the following amendment:

On page 2, line 5 after the "period" add the sentence

The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this act.

The facility proposed under the bill is an international, maximum security, import animal quarantine station. It would be established at an offshore location on U.S. territory, under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture. American livestock producers, breeders, and research institutions could import foreign animal breeds through this facility as a means for upgrading the genetic quality of the domestic livestock population.

Because of the security measures that would be maintained at the facility along with the use of laboratory tests and other rigid procedures, livestock and wild animals in the United States would still be protected against exposure to such destructive foreign diseases and pests as foot-and-mouth disease, and rinderpest. The Department would thus continue to carry out its responsibility for preventing livestock diseases from entering the United States from foreign countries.

There is at present an absolute statutory prohibition against the importation of ruminants and swine, as well as against fresh, chilled, or frozen meat from such animals, if they originate in countries that the Department has declared to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. This prohibition is contained in section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Wild zoo animals are specifically exempted, but only if they are to be exhibited at an approved zoological park. Furthermore, once these animals reach an approved park, they cannot be moved except to another approved zoological park.

Other statutes, generally referred to as the animal quarantine laws, broaden the prohibitions and restrictions to include other destructive livestock diseases and pests.

Under Federal regulations, prohibitions and restrictions are applied not only to the importation of animals, meats, and animal byproducts, but to such materials as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist. All of these regulations are based on the best and most current scientific information available. This includes the results of research conducted

at the ARS Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in Long Island, N.Y.

To date, efforts to accomplish the objectives of these various laws and regulations are proving highly successful. Except for the limited introduction of breeding animals through the proposed facility, the present prohibitory statutes preventing the entry of domestic ruminants and swine, and fresh or fresh frozen meats and meat products would continue.

But this kind of protection is only a part of efforts to keep the American livestock industry prosperous. The marketplace today is far more competitive than it was 50, 20, or even 10 years ago. This means that domestic livestock producers must continually upgrade the quality of their products while achieving further efficiency and economy in production.

Some of the changes that are taking place originate with consumers. For example, a continuing rise in our standard of living is creating stronger consumer demands for more livestock products, particularly beef. And in certain instances, notably meat and milk, this increased demand is highly selective. More and more consumers are looking for new or improved products that contain less fat and greater proportions of other desirable nutrients.

Many such products have been developed, and many more are on the way. But time is the critical element here. The very nature of livestock production makes it most difficult to adjust production patterns and methods quickly.

A basic solution to this problem is the selective breeding and development of animals that possess the characteristics desired. This is at best a slow process. And it is complicated by the fact that the genetic base of some classes of livestock in the United States is extremely limited.

American beef cattle, dairy cattle, and sheep are based on a small number of breeds from a very few countries of origin. Most of them originated in the British Isles. The Netherlands supplied our most important dairy breed, and France contributed our most important sheep breed. All of these bloodlines were introduced into our country between 60 and 80 years ago.

Today scientific observations and preliminary investigations suggest that other foreign breeds may have the characteristics we need for meeting current and future needs.

Further, in both theory and practice, it has been found that the more diverse the genetic contributions of the parents, the more vigorous and productive the resulting hybrid will be. This has already been demonstrated in the plant kingdom. By crossing germ plasma from exotic foreign plants with domestic crop plants, plant geneticists have developed many new and high-yielding hybrid varieties that are now grown extensively on American ranches and farms.

Both the American livestock industry and the American consumer, then, stand to benefit from the introduction and organized use of certain foreign animal breeds. The changes desired could thus be brought about more rapidly and efficiently.

Of course, these changes should not be achieved at the risk of introducing a livestock disease or pest not now present in this country. But

they could be achieved, we believe, through the application of existing technology on foreign animal diseases and safe and orderly use of the quarantine facility under the absolute control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Some of the specific changes we anticipate could bring about a revolution of sorts in American livestock production. For beef cattle producers, these changes might include increases in weaning weight and in postweaning growth rates and muscularity. Other possible improvements might include a decrease in the proportion of carcass waste, and improved fertility and calf survival. Dairy farmers could look for increases in milk production, fertility, and calf survival.

We anticipate that about \$2.5 million would be needed on a non-recurring basis for constructing the facilities. We further estimate that maintenance and operating expenses will total about \$1.3 million annually.

Maintenance and operating costs would be offset largely by collecting fees from importers for use of the quarantine facilities. Such fees would cover costs involved in the care, feeding, and handling of animals during the quarantine period. Fees would also cover other costs incidental to quarantining the animals. These costs include expenses for equipment, utilities, fences, supplies, and materials—to the extent that these items are not covered by appropriations.

In this connection, the budgetary situation is such that we are now implementing plans to reduce Federal funds for construction. Because of this, we would have to consider the need for increased appropriations to construct and operate the proposed quarantine station along with other high-priority programs of the Department.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

At the present time do you have any locations in mind?

Dr. MULHERN. No, sir. We have visited several locations, primarily in the Caribbean area, but we have not decided on any specific location.

Senator JORDAN. I think this legislation and this type of quarantine to bring animals into our country should have been enacted a long time ago.

I happen to know something about the length of time that it takes to bring cattle through Canada, and the cost that they add on there. Of course, they run that for a profit, but the profit is running pretty high. I think it is holding back the development of finer breeds in the United States.

As you pointed out, the public today wants good meat, but less fat.

Dr. MULHERN. Yes, sir.

Senator JORDAN. The packinghouse industry is interested in cattle that have as little waste as possible, and that makes the price of beef cheaper to the consuming public.

I believe the Canadian law is 6 months, isn't it, before we can bring cattle in from there.

Dr. MULHERN. It is that length of time between the initial isolation on the premise of origin and the end of time spent in quarantine at the Canadian station. However, after leaving the quarantine station in Canada they also go to a bonded farm where they are exposed to

Canadian cattle for 90 days. In addition, the quarantine at the station has been extended for 60 to 90 days because when the period was completed they couldn't remove the animals until the ice thawed in the St. Lawrence River where the station is located.

Senator JORDAN. It costs a lot of money to transport cattle from Canada into the United States.

Dr. MULHERN. Yes.

Senator JORDAN. I remember one place where there was a wreck, and all the cows were crippled except one. That was the Charolais, a very expensive cow. I don't think that is necessary at all.

The United States has spent millions and millions of dollars, as you know, trying to stamp out the hoof-and-mouth disease, and we don't want to permit it to start here again. That has happened in the case of Mexico and other areas that infest our area. So I have no doubt that the Department could run a satisfactory quarantine and save our people a great deal of money, and also expedite the bringing in of any types of cattle that would, as you said, crossbreed and improve the production and quality of our animals.

Did you have anything to add, sir?

Dr. WARWICK. Not unless there are some specific questions, sir.

Senator JORDAN. I have no specific questions. You may add anything that you want to.

Dr. MULHERN. We feel that, as you said, Mr. Chairman, that these animals can be imported safely. We feel that we have enough experience observing the Canadian operations, that any of the particular problems associated with that importation procedure have been overcome, and we think it can be done satisfactorily.

It is our understanding that the Canadians this year will have paid for the costs required to construct their facilities. So the importation of these animals has paid for the initial outlay that the country experienced in order to establish the facility.

Senator JORDAN. I think they still use them for their own use, is that right?

Dr. MULHERN. Absolutely.

Senator JORDAN. The Canadians are interested in raising cattle for their own use. And they are great cattle users.

Dr. MULHERN. That is right.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much. I thoroughly agree with your amendments to the bill, as I said in my opening statement, and I thoroughly agree that we should be allowed to accept land, buildings, or anything anybody wants to give us. I see no reason why we shouldn't.

Thank you very much for being with us.

Dr. MULHERN. Thank you, sir.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. McMillan, we are glad to have you with us. Do you have anybody else with you?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir, I appear by myself.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. McMillan is president of the National Cattle-men's Association of Denver.

We are very glad to hear from you. And you may proceed as you wish.

**STATEMENT OF C. W. McMILLAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,
AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, DENVER,
COLO.**

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On behalf of the American National Cattlemen's Association we do appreciate this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee and endorse enactment of S. 2306, which provides for the establishment of an international livestock quarantine station by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Some years ago, our association looked with disfavor upon the establishment of a similar quarantine station in Canada. Our fears were based entirely upon the dread that foot-and-mouth disease would gain entry into the United States. After long and serious discussions with the U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists, assurances were given that testing techniques had been developed to the point where, if properly followed, any latent foot-and-mouth virus in any animal originating from a country known to be infested with the disease could be detected.

Since that time, the project has been successful and animals have been brought into the North American Continent without foot-and-mouth disease having been discovered. However, this does not lessen our association's concern that every possible means should be employed to prevent foot-and-mouth disease from gaining entry into the United States or any spot on the North American Continent.

There is a demand for the entry of new germ plasm so that the beef cattle herds of the United States can continue to be improved, thus assuring the consuming public of a constant supply of high-quality, wholesome beef for the years to come. Research has demonstrated that a great potential exists for crossbreeding which can increase the vigor, growth, and in many cases the efficiency of cattle production. Coupled with this, has been a desire that wider genetic diversity of the parent stock be available in order that hybrid vigor can be developed.

The Canadian cattlemen, of course, recognize this same thing. As a consequence, they are not permitting live animals to be shipped to the United States through their quarantine facilities. This opens the door for subterfuge and possible circumvention of the quarantine laws. Cattle might even be smuggled into the United States, thus creating an even greater danger of foot-and-mouth infestation because no quarantine would have taken place.

Because there is an apparent need for new germ plasm in the United States, and because we feel that the germ plasms should be brought in under the most stringent quarantine and sanitary conditions, we feel a strong need for a U.S. quarantine station to be built. With the location of such an "International Quarantine Station" as proposed by the Department of Agriculture in the Caribbean, we feel that the proper conditions can be maintained, thus preserving the foot-and-mouth disease-free status of the United States.

There could be economies associated with our own quarantine station as well. The Department of Agriculture currently has to send American veterinarians to those nations and accompany these foreign livestock through all of the elaborate quarantine controls. This is necessary because the USDA cannot afford the risk of not sending veterinarians

to see that every procedure is followed. Obviously, the more countries that seek to do this, the greater the expense to the American Government, and the more difficult it is to supervise the increasingly diverse systems of quarantine control of other nations. Similar problems exist in the case of zoo animals coming into the United States.

In summary, because the quarantine procedure will be under the control of our own scientists, the likelihood of foot-and-mouth disease gaining entry to the United States through such an "International Quarantine Station" will be very minimal. The potential benefits to our livestock industry and to the consumers of the United States certainly justify such a station. The fees to be charged for the use of the station by those importing the animals will make it largely self-sustaining. Consequently, there would be little cost to the taxpayers of the United States.

The American National Cattlemen's Association respectfully requests early action on S. 2306 so that we might move forward on this very important project.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much, Mr. McMillan.

I believe the suggestion of setting the station up somewhere in the Caribbean area is a wise one, because I am told that from 2 to 3 months in the year the quarantine station in Canada is frozen and they can't move the animals. It takes more feed for an animal in cold weather than it does in a medium warm climate. It is the same with people.

So I think that would be a good place to go.

Mr. McMILLAN. If I might interrupt you, Senator, the thought of having it down there too would provide that isolation that is so important in terms of a true quarantine.

Senator JORDAN. It lends itself, portwise and transportationwise.

Senator Bellmon, we are delighted you got here. We would be glad to hear you. We know that you are very much interested in livestock, and your State is.

Senator BELLMON. Let me ask Mr. McMillan, with all the use of artificial insemination at the present time, are we able now to bring in sperm from other countries without clearance?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Department of Agriculture, Senator, has a very elaborate system of permitting sperm to be brought in through the Plum Island Station located in New York State, or on Long Island Sound, I guess is technically where it is located. They collect the semen in the foreign countries under very stringent conditions and then bring it to the United States. And it undergoes additional stringent tests at Plum Island before it is permitted to be used any place in the United States.

One of the disadvantages of this system is that it is extremely expensive. Having the opportunity to bring in the live animals and thus collect the semen here would be a much more efficient manner to handle it, at least for those who would wish to employ artificial insemination.

Senator BELLMON. The diseases we are mostly concerned with are foot and mouth and rinderpest?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Are those diseases transmitted through sperm? I am at a loss as to why we should have to go through all this.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, scientists tell me that both foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest can be transmitted through sperm.

Senator BELLMON. Does the American National Cattlemen's Association recommend any changes in the method presently used for clearing sperm for importation?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir. As far as we can determine—here again from what the scientists tell us—it is almost foolproof; I said almost because there is always a possibility for slip up. And by the same token the system that is used in Canada is almost foolproof. But with the demand, as I indicated in my statement, for new germ plasma to gain entry into the United States, we feel that to be absolutely safe we should have a station under our own control.

Senator BELLMON. I certainly agree. I am concerned, as I think everyone is, that we have to continually improve the quality of our livestock production and the efficiency of meat production. And I think it is the consumers who really have a stake in this question, not so much the producers.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Senator JORDAN. I am told that the use of artificial insemination by small ranchers is a very expensive proposition, because it has to be handled scientifically. If the animal itself, the bull, could be brought to the ranch, particularly in the case of the small rancher, it would save him a lot of money and it would be better all the way around. I think that is pretty universally known; is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, that is true, Senator. And yet on the other hand if you have an opportunity for the collection of semen from a bull that, say, is in the United States, moving in the other direction, it does give a chance to the smaller rancher, particularly the smaller purebred rancher, to inseminate his cows with the highest quality, finest germ plasma that he can find without having to own such bulls.

Senator JORDAN. That is quite true. I know a good deal about where this is being done now very successfully. But it still is an expensive way of doing it. If we could get a bigger percentage of purebred bulls in here, which we would do if we could bring them in faster, and scatter them around, it would serve the purpose quicker and better.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; I agree with you. As I indicated in response to Senator Bellmon's question, it is a matter of efficiency. The system we employ in bringing semen in through Plum Island is now a very expensive method.

Senator JORDAN. Did you have any other question?

Senator BELLMON. No, thank you.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. McMILLAN. Thank you, sir.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Straus, do you have anyone with you?

Mr. STRAUS. No.

Senator JORDAN. You may proceed as you wish.

STATEMENT OF JOE R. STRAUS, JR., FITZHUGH-STRAUS MEDINA HEREFORD RANCH, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. STRAUS. First of all I want to say that I don't want to appear to be presumptuous that I know more about the problems of agriculture than you gentlemen do, because I know that is not true.

And also from hearing the remarks this morning, I think, I am going to be kind of an echo, it sounds like. But I appear here only as an interested and concerned producer in agriculture, and an interested citizen.

We have been involved in ranching and farming in south Texas, my father and my brother and another partner. And we featured purebred Hereford cattle in our operation for many years. Our registered herd was first established in 1914 by one of the pioneer breeders of our area. We bought this herd and combined it with our own around 25 years ago. Up until a year ago, we operated with over 1,000 cows in our registered herd. At the present time, we have approximately 600 head of registered Hereford cows, 100 head of commercial cows. We have seen market conditions change and know that agriculture has not kept pace with other industries insofar as the producers return on investment is concerned or from the standpoint of price increases on livestock to cover increased costs.

I have heard that 25 years ago the average consumer spent around \$24 to \$25 of every \$100 he earned for groceries. Today, the same consumer only spends around \$16 to \$17 for every \$100 earned for food. This is a wonderful thing for the consumer and certainly as compared to the countries behind the Iron Curtain and other areas of the world, American people are getting a great bargain. This has been brought about mainly because the producer has been forced to use all forms of innovations, technology, efficiency and techniques that allow him to operate in a highly competitive and perishable commodity market. Today the livestock producer can only survive if he is able to innovate and find ways of producing cheaper and more efficiently because costs are skyrocketing. Just about everything costs considerably more today—ranch equipment, labor, and supplies. Labor formerly cost the ranchman around \$50 per month for a good man and in some cases room and board. This was around 30 years ago. Today, for the same labor, he must pay at least \$300 per month and, of course housing and other fringe benefits, and so forth. The main interest from a political standpoint has been to protect 94 percent of the population which represents the consumer rather than the remaining 6 percent which represents the producer in agriculture and I suppose to a greater portion of our urban population this seems justifiable. This leaves no one to protect the 6 percent representing the producer except himself and a few farsighted leaders of Government. All, really, the producer is asking for is an even break so that he can help himself produce more efficiently to continue to give the consumer the great bargain he is used to seeing at the marketplace.

This brings me to the subject at hand—namely the need for quarantine facilities for the importation of livestock for breeding purposes. Experiment stations belonging to great universities of this country have long proven that there is a marked improvement in weaning weight of calves and more efficient gain ability when certain breeds of livestock are crossbred with other breeds, thus increasing the production efficiency. This efficiency is commonly known as hybrid vigor. This hybrid vigor is usually obtained to a greater degree when wide outcrosses between breeds is done other than outcrosses between families within a breed.

Every breed of cattle has certain characteristics of its own—some good and some bad. We have come to the conclusion after much study that there are breeds of cattle located in Europe and other places which have characteristics that would be highly desirable from a crossbreeding standpoint with our domestic breeds. In fact, just recently we had our partner and manager of our registered operation make a 3,500-mile automobile trip through Europe. His and our eyes were opened like never before as to the possibilities offered. Some of the breeds we had never heard of before—such as, Maine-Anjou, Limousin, Simmental—I had never heard of these before in my life—and other breeds which have been available only on a limited basis such as Charolais. Immediately upon returning from this trip, we looked into the possibilities of importing cattle for crossbreeding purposes and found, much to our dismay, our country had no quarantine facilities.

I have just attended part of the recent Inter-American Cattle Federation convention held in San Antonio—which is our hometown—the name of which is CIAGA, and was impressed by the fact that the Central and South American countries are looking to us for leadership in providing the kind of seed stock which will produce the right kind of cattle for them. If we don't take this leadership, there is even talk that some of the other countries might. I am talking from the standpoint of importation of new breeds of seed stock for crossbreeding purposes. I am sure you would conclude the same as I have that their controls might not be as rigid as ours would be. There could be a danger of dissemination of contagious diseases through this hemisphere if popular quarantine facilities and techniques were not followed. As I understand it, the Department of Agriculture has been operating under a 1930 law which prohibits the importation of livestock from most countries of Europe. Nothing has been done to modify this law or to give the Department of Agriculture any discretionary authority, probably because we have not seen the need for importation of breeding stock and have not established proper quarantine facilities. So, in my opinion, the first thing that needs to be done is to establish proper quarantine facilities to adequately handle healthy livestock for crossbreeding purposes so that when these breeds are available in this country, we can rest assured that there is no danger of bringing in contagious diseases with them.

Senator JORDAN. One of the troubles is, I think, that the Secretary of Agriculture has not had the authority to establish a quarantine station. And I think this is because there hasn't been sufficient demand or call for it. But it is developing very rapidly now, and I think the cattlemen see the need for it, as you point out here.

Mr. STRAUS. I think this can develop into a great two-way street.

Recently I know of around 200 head of hogs that West Germany bought for crossbreeding purposes. These hogs were bought within the last 2 weeks here in the United States. While it is true we will not accept livestock from West Germany because of the danger of hoof-and-mouth disease, they are accepting and quarantining our hogs. They are free of Bangs disease and TB, and are able to do this without any danger of bringing in these diseases. And yet they were able to bring in our hogs and livestock without any danger of bringing in these diseases because of adequate quarantine facilities that they maintain.

Senator JORDAN. Where is that in Germany, do you know?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; I don't know where the station is.

I might also suggest investigation of possibilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture instituting a conference on quarantine procedures so that other interested nations can standardize on proper and adequate protective procedures. The first thing is to get our own quarantine facilities established so that we can continue to improve our techniques of producing more efficient higher yielding market animals. In looking to the future as the population increases dramatically, so will the need for protein increase. In fact we have many nations of our Western Hemisphere which are suffering from malnutrition and the need for protein. They have tried vegetable forms but they find they need meat as a more complete protein. You can see that we need to prepare now for the future. As the population in this country increases and spreads westward, we will find ourselves in much the same position as the countries of Europe, that is, the producer will be forced to produce livestock on less acreage using different techniques to do it. I have seen test results on breeds of cattle tested in South Africa under conditions similar to western and southwestern parts of the United States. The results taken over a 10-year period show some of these breeds, not available to us, to show up much superior to our domestic breeds in many areas, particularly in the area of fertility, weaning weights, slaughter weights in relation to age, the size of the loin eye and other tests. So we must make these breeds available to the producer in this country in order to progress from an efficiency and production standpoint.

Our good neighbor to the north, Canada, has been reaping a tremendous harvest in dollars from the sale of semen to producers in this country using European breeds which are not available in the United States. They have been recovering approximately \$12 per vial of semen and your mathematics will quickly tell you that this represents upwards of \$50,000 a year per bull used. We have heard that the bulls used in Canada for this purpose are not truly representative of the best breeding stock available in Europe. The European cattle producer has been keeping performance records on livestock for almost 60 years but these records don't do us much good because the progeny is not available to us. The only opposition of the establishment of rigidly controlled quarantine facilities could only be for selfish reasons of those who refuse to accept the need for progress.

I have two other letters to enter into the record, and I would like to submit them.

Senator JORDAN. You may submit them right after your remarks. They will be carried in their entirety.

Isn't it true that there have been some cattle smuggled into the United States from Mexico and maybe some other places too?

Mr. STRAUS. I don't know. I have heard this.

Senator JORDAN. I have heard it several years back. Some fellow would wind up with a Charolais and you would ask where it came from, and he would say, "You guess."

Mr. STRAUS. I would imagine that they had to be smuggled in from Mexico, because we don't accept cattle from across the border from Mexico.

Senator JORDAN. It is possible that some of this has happened out of Canada. But they have been pretty rigid there because they have the reputation of their animals being free of disease before they leave. As I pointed out, they have made a handsome profit on that situation, which our cattlemen should not have to pay. I have heard of a number of breeds which, as you say, would possibly be even better than those we know about now and have here. They ought to be allowed to be brought in.

Another thing, by letting foreign nations know what our standards are, it would save shipping cows or bulls into this country that wouldn't pass our standards of quarantine, which is an expensive proposition.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

I would like to make some remarks in response to one thing you asked a while ago, Senator Bellmon, as to whether or not the importation of semen would serve our purposes. And I believe in order to establish purebred herds of some of new breeds that you would have to import some cows. So that would make it almost mandatory to set up the proper quarantine facilities to do that.

Senator BELLMON. As you know, the Charolais breed doesn't require this—you can start off with an English breed and continue until you get a 15/16 pure breed.

But you are a purebred breeder of Herefords.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Speaking for yourself, or possibly for other purebred breeders, do you feel that generally our established beef industry would welcome a system that would allow importation of new breeds? And the reason I raise the question is, you have a near monopoly now.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes.

Senator BELLMON. And if you bring in, let's say, Simmental, and they turn out to be a superior breed, this is perhaps going to make your livestock in a little less demand. What is the general feeling among the breeders?

Mr. STRAUS. I think if I take that attitude—I guess it does sound like heresy for a Hereford breeder to be saying that—but we have recently taken the attitude that if there are superior breeds to be found, maybe we ought to be producing them.

Senator BELLMON. I think that is a very commendable position. But I thought it ought to be in the record that the established purebred breeders would welcome this facility and would welcome the competition from additional breeds.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir. And I think particularly the commercial breeder welcomes it. In fact, there are many commercial breeders in south Texas, and I think all over the United States, that are making these Canadian facilities pretty wealthy right now with this semen that they are using in a commercial operation, they are buying this semen.

Senator BELLMON. It is a substantial drain on our country's economy to be continually paying money out when we can just as well go ahead and establish a quarantine station and bring the animal here so that they can be in production in this country rather than some place else.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other questions.

Senator JORDAN. I happen to know Mr. Bunker Hunt, and I am sure you do. He is, I believe, the largest rancher of Charolais in the United States. I know he has brought in a good many cattle from Canada, and has spent a lot of money doing so. I know several others who have done the same thing, and they are working in the direction of crossbreeding and developing feeder calves for the market.

Do you have any further questions?

Senator BELLMON. I would like again to make the record clear, the testimony this morning apparently has been from people interested in the beef business. Now, this quarantine station would serve all kinds of animals, even exotic breeds, this is not just for cattle, the quarantine station; isn't that true?

Mr. STRAUS. I am of course just speaking from the cattle business standpoint. I would assume that the quarantine facility would be for everything.

Senator JORDAN. Yes; it would be for hogs and any animal that might be brought in. The law already covers animals for zoos, and protected already in the law. So that would be no problem. But bringing in certain breeds of swine, sheep, and goats is also very desirable.

I know from our agricultural attachés in several countries where I have visited that we have helped these other countries a great deal by sending them poultry, sheep, hogs, and cattle to breed with their own livestock. But they have been a little bit smarter than we have. We have been sending them these animals, and yet we have almost prohibited them from bringing in theirs because we haven't had the facilities to do it.

I think this is a very timely piece of legislation, and I hope we can report it to the full committee and get some action on it.

Mr. STRAUS. I would like to make one more remark.

You asked about us as a Hereford business. Of course, I don't think we will ever go out of Hereford breeding. And I think there is a place for the breeders of the United States to crossbreed also, and to provide the purebred seed stock for the commercial rancher. I don't think any of these new breeds or anything is ever going to endanger the position of the present breeds that we now have.

Senator JORDAN. Isn't it true, if you take a pure breed like Hereford and breed—say a purebred Charolais—you get a much finer offspring than you would if you used any run-of-the-mill cow that came along, halfbreeds or scrubs. The better breeding stock you turn to the better calf you are going to get.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. Let me ask one other question in connection with this.

I am assuming that in this country we have available perhaps the top animals in what we refer to as the English breeds, the shorthorn and Hereford and Angus. But this quarantine station would make it possible to bring in new bloodlines even of these breeds.

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Senator BELLMON. So that it might result in the upgrading of our existing breeds.

Mr. STRAUS. Absolutely, at a much lower cost to the producer.

Senator BELLMON. That is all.

(The letters referred to above are as follows:)

CASTROVILLE, TEX., *October 18, 1969.*

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: As cattle breeders and individuals dependent upon progressive cattle improvement for our income we would like to state our reasons for desiring the importation of Simmental cattle or a corollary breed (theoretically the same breed with a different name in various countries) from Switzerland, West Germany, or France.

As the emphasis on beef cattle improvement shifts towards faster, more efficient gains, better cut-out value with more lean meat and less fat per unit of production, U.S. beef breeders are taking dead aim on the factors that contribute towards these goals. These factors are recognized as: (1) superior muscling qualities and beef conformation, (2) mother cows with high milk production, (3) good fertility in bulls and cows, (4) inherent factors for rapid growth, (5) consolidated hereditary characteristics that give the hybrid vigor so necessary for modern economic cross-breeding.

The importance of performance and production records have been generally recognized for a number of years. However, the mass of beef producers in this country have been slow to accept and adopt meaningful record keeping systems as a part of their operations. Therefore, the percentage of cattle in the U.S. that are thoroughly performance or production tested are in a serious minority as far as being a factor for rapidly influencing the improvement of the considerable number of U.S. cattle herds.

In Europe, because land values are very high, each animal kept as a brood cow or herd sire *must produce*. Consequently, the Swiss and W. German breeders have established programs and standards that assist them in finding the top animals for herd replacements. A program has been in effect for over 60 years in which only those cattle meeting certain standards of production and points of conformation are eligible for registration.

This rigid selection in the Simmental cattle, Europe's most numerous breed, places them in a prominent position among the world's cattle population.

The combination of high milk production (in Europe the Simmental is also used for dairy purposes) in a beef animal is seemingly an answer to the cross-breeding dreams of U.S. cattlemen who have long felt the need for increased milk production, while maintaining rapid growth rates in their commercial beef programs.

The systematic improvement of the Simmental breed, based on proven and consolidated lines, and on careful individual selection for type and productivity, has made it possible to reach a high degree of uniformity and security in the transmission of hereditary characteristics.

The consolidation of these hereditary characteristics practically guarantees the transmission of these inherent abilities in a prepotent way. For this reason, the breed is chosen in many regions of the world for crossbreeding programs.

Unquestionably, Simmental crossbred cows, regardless of the percentage of blood, are going to contribute immeasurably to the beef industry of the United States.

At the present time however, the only way U. S. breeders can obtain this new genetic material is through artificial insemination with semen collected from the few Simmental bulls that have been imported into Canada. This is a slow and somewhat ineffective way to bring about the much needed benefit our cattle herds need. Also, there has been some question regarding the discretion used in selection by the importers of bulls now in Canada.

European countries are annually importing numerous quantities of livestock from the United States with, what they feel, is a possible danger of re-introducing Bangs and T.B. into their countries. They feel that there should be some type of reciprocal program in which they could export to the U. S.

Certainly, we do not want to endanger our herds to Hoof and Mouth Disease, but it is our feeling that a concentrated effort is needed on the part of our government to work out a program in which adequate quarantine procedures could be established to safely allow entry of Simmental cattle and other European breeds into the United States.

It is our understanding that we are presently restricted by an antiquated 1930 law. We feel that it is time that this law is either revised or amended so that the problem may be approached in a workable manner.

Canada and its citizens have reaped a multi-million dollar dividend from U. S. livestock producers in the past three years by allowing liberal importations and by setting up adequate quarantine stations. In addition, by restricting the subsequent exportation of female cattle into the U. S., they have captured many American dollars as U.S. cattlemen have established ranches in Canada, have purchased vast quantities of bull semen from Canadian sources, and have purchased many cattle contributing to Canadian profits.

In view of the foregoing, we urge you to take an interest and give support to the liberalization of American importation laws and/or the setting up of quarantine stations in which healthy animals may be cleared for importation. We believe that this matter is of prime importance to the future economy of a large segment of our American beef industry.

Sincerely,

M. W. SHARP, D.V.M.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., *October 23, 1969.*

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: In view of the importance of the Twenty Billion Dollar cattle production industry in the United States, we wholeheartedly endorse the proposed establishment of a livestock quarantine station off the coast of the United States. It is also our opinion that the quarantine law of 1930 should be amended, or revised, to make it more flexible, whereby it would permit the breeders of the United States to import improved breeds of beef cattle, or other livestock, into the United States.

We ranchers realize that we have enjoyed a gradual increase in demand for our products. We also anticipate this demand will continue for years to come. It is estimated that this year in the United States, our capital consumption of beef will be from 108 to 110 pounds per person. With our population increasing each year, not only in the United States, but entire world, we are going to witness a gradual increasing demand for our beef.

We do not have any more land available for cattle production, therefore, we must perfect ways and means whereby we can produce more beef per acre than we are now producing. This will necessitate a more efficient production. Experience and experimental station data has proved that one of the best and most efficient ways to increase beef production is by crossbreeding. It has been proved, without doubt, when we cross two or more superior breeds, one will increase his beef cattle production ten to twenty per cent annually. Beef cattle producers in the United States today are making many changes in their operations so they can meet present day competition.

More emphasis is being placed today on breeding beef cattle that will produce more red meat and less fat and, also an animal, who will make a faster and more efficient gain. We are striving to select breeding herds that will possess the following breeding traits:

- (1) Inherit factors for rapid growth.
- (2) Superior fertility among bulls and cows.
- (3) Select cattle with outstanding beef conformation that will possess superior muscling qualities.
- (4) Cows with higher milk production.

All of these factors are very important.

It has been our observation that there are several superior breeds of beef cattle, or dual purpose cattle, in Europe that would certainly be highly important to our crossbreeding program in the United States. But the breeders in the United States are certainly at a disadvantage today since it is impossible for us to import these cattle to the United States. The only place we can get these cattle, and that is semen only, is through Canada. Canada is receiving many millions of dollars each year from breeders of the United States for semen and, also, many millions of United States Dollars have been invested in Canada for ranch land where they can produce cattle from European countries.

We sincerely urge that you support a change in our American import law of 1930, giving discretionary power to the Department of Agriculture and, also, the establishment of an adequate quarantine station.

Sincerely yours,

MEDINA HEREFORD RANCH,
J. R. STRAUS, Jr.
H. R. FITZHUGH.

Senator JORDAN. Mr. Mulhern, I believe you had something you wanted to add.

Dr. MULHERN. Mr. Chairman, just for clarification of Senator Bellmon's question, the quarantine station would be for all species. As far as zoo animals, they already have a way of coming in. However, the immediate benefit is going to go to the cattle industry, because we have a laboratory test to detect foot and mouth disease carrier animals in cattle. We are doing research to detect the carriers in sheep and swine. We are confident we will find effective carrier tests for them also. As soon as these tests are available, the other species will be able to come in too. The primary, or immediate, benefit for such a quarantine station will be for the cattle industry because we do have adequate tests to identify infected or carrier animals in that species.

Senator BELLMON. Let me ask you this. Suppose a breeder buys an animal, say, in France. And if we had the quarantine station in operation, how long a period of time would it take him to get the animal brought into the United States and cleared for use?

Dr. MULHERN. We would say about 5 months. We expect that we could make two importations a year, and allow time to clean up between importations. It is not only the quarantine time that is important in assuring ourselves that the animals are safe. It is equally important that we know the history of where that animal originated. We would have to go through the same procedures as Canada has done to assure ourselves that the history of herd is OK, hold them in quarantine in the exporting country for 30 days while we conducted tests on them, and then move them to our quarantine station.

So this is why the 5-month period.

Senator BELLMON. How long would they actually be in the quarantine station here?

Dr. MULHERN. Ninety days. And again it isn't the length of time that is the only factor being considered, but the tests that we will be conducting during that period of time.

Senator JORDAN. Thank you very much. I am glad you clarified that. That was my understanding, and I am glad you made that plain.

I appreciate everybody being here to testify this morning, and also the visitors who are interested in the bill. This will conclude the hearing, and as soon as Senator Ellender can get his full committee together, I will report this bill. I believe I can report it favorably, as I don't have any opposition anywhere. So we will expedite this as quickly as possible.

Thank you very much.

Thank you for being with us, Senator Bellmon.

(Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.)

(Additional statements filed for the record are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT DOLE, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. Chairman, my home State, Kansas, which has long been known for its wheat production, has come to depend heavily on the cattle industry. As a matter of fact, recent surveys by Kansas State University have disclosed the fact that cattle feeding and breeding and beef processing have become the No. 1 dollar-contributing element of the Kansas economy—nearly \$1.2 billion in 1968.

As today's witnesses have pointed out, there is a considerable potential for improvement of cattle and other livestock through the introduction of new genetic configurations and blood lines into the strains common to the U.S. throughout the world varieties of livestock and other domesticated animals exist which

possess characteristics of heartiness, fertility and slaughter weights unknown to animals bred in the United States.

Although these foreign strains may hold great potential for the improvement of American livestock, a serious and, heretofore, almost insurmountable barrier has existed to their introduction into this country. Because of the grave and justified concern for the control and elimination of animal disease, especially foot and mouth disease and rinderpest, U.S. laws regulating the importation of breeding animals have effectively barred all imports of breeding stock.

Recognizing both the desirability of improving U.S. stock and the necessity for insuring continued freedom from disease, S. 2306 embodies a highly desirable approach to the importation of foreign breeding stock. By establishing an island quarantine station where animals bound for the United States may be thoroughly examined and observed, this bill will enable our country to take advantage of the breeding advances made in other parts of the world while maintaining the same strict safeguards against disease that have been the hallmark of our national livestock production.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee to testify in support of S. 2306. Senator Hruska's bill to establish an international livestock quarantine station within the territory of the United States. Because of the great need and importance of this bill to livestock producers and American consumers alike, I join Senator Hruska in supporting this bill.

S. 2306 provides the necessary authority for the Department of Agriculture to locate a suitable site for and to establish and operate a quarantine station. In connection with the station, the bill permits the movement of animals into the United States which would otherwise be prohibited or restricted under the present import laws.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the American livestock industry has for over 30 years been limited in the types of breeds that can be imported into the United States. Only breeds from those countries that were free of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest could be imported. This restriction was imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, and it made good sense at the time. The United States had just eradicated an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, and nobody wanted it to recur. The veterinary techniques then known were not adequate to determine whether an animal being imported was a disease-carrier or not, and the safest procedure was to prohibit imports from countries that had the disease. As a result of this policy, the United States has been free from this disease ever since.

Also, Mr. Chairman, our livestock producers have not in the past been hampered by this import limitation. They had excellent breeds readily available within the United States or from disease-free countries. However, that is changing. The interest in new exotic breeds that are not now available is increasing.

The reason for this increasing interest is the growing demand of the American consumer for meat, and at the same time the growing numbers of American consumers. It is estimated that our nation's population will increase by another 100 million by the year 2000. With the productivity and weaning weights of present livestock breeds, there is serious concern that the livestock industry will not be able to keep supply up with demand and keep the price of meat as reasonable as it is.

New breeds can achieve more rapid improvement in animal characteristics than can the process of selectivity within our domestic breeds. New breeding stock can increase the ratio of the number of births to the number of head of stock each year. New bloodlines can greatly improve the survival rate of young stock, improve the feed conversion rate, and increase the weaning weight.

Such crossbreeding with new stock can promote more rapid growth and size of livestock, and enable producers to market them sooner.

Of course, importing these new bloodlines into the United States will not be an easy task. The Canadian Government established a procedure for importing stock from disease-ridden countries into Canada, and found that elaborate quarantine and test devices were necessary. The process was also expensive. However, the Canadians have been able to prevent through this system any diseased animal from entering into Canada. The risk is considered worth the cost in Canada

because of the benefits the producers are deriving there from the new bloodlines. American producers have even brought new stock in through Canada for ultimate export into the United States. This was possible because Canada is disease-free and can freely export to the United States. Our importers found that the Canadians charged from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per head for the quarantine procedure. As a result, the Canadians have made their station a profitable endeavor. The answer for the American producers is a United States quarantine station, operated by the United States Government.

More livestock can be brought into the United States as a result and the livestock can be brought in more cheaply. Of equal importance, the United States Government will be in control of the facilities and we can assure that the veterinary test techniques used will always be of the highest quality.

I am told that the Department of Agriculture has researched this matter and has determined that present knowledge of disease detection is adequate to devise quarantine facilities and establish tests that can assure with almost no risk that livestock with foot-and-mouth disease will not pass through the quarantine station.

In my opinion, if the importation of new breeds is greatly desired by some American producers, a quarantine station owned and operated by the United States for all livestock imports from diseased areas of the world would be the ideal solution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this legislation be enacted.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEN B. JORDAN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee in support of S. 2306, introduced by Senator Hruska and co-sponsored by me and other of my colleagues in the Senate.

After this legislation was introduced, I submitted copies of the bill to leaders of the livestock industry in my state and solicited comment.

Marvin J. Wittman, President of the Idaho Cattlemen's Association, wrote me on August 9th that he was sure that a maximum security quarantine station for importing breeding stock would be an asset to most commercial cattlemen. He also made these statements in support of his endorsement:

"There is an intense effort on the part of most commercial cattlemen to improve the quality and performance of their beef cattle. This includes heavier weaning weights for cow-calf operators, better feed conversion in the feed lot and a more desirable carcass with more muscling and less waste fat when these animals are hung on the rail. Some progress has been made in these areas, using the standard English breeds—Hereford, Shorthorn, and Angus. New breeds from France and other areas of the world have been used on a limited basis in cross-breeding programs. The success of beef cattle improvement is dependent upon the availability of this imported breeding stock.

"I have discussed this bill with Dr. James Kraus and Morris Hemstrom of the University of Idaho and others in the industry. It is our opinion that an importing quarantine station for breeding stock would also benefit the consumer because of the increase in quality of the end product."

The importance of this legislation to the research program now going forward in the Land-Grant Colleges and other academic institutions is brought out in a College of Agriculture memorandum submitted to me in early November by Robert W. Coonrod, Academic Vice-President of the University of Idaho. I hereby request that this memorandum, written by T. Donald Bell of the College of Agriculture, be incorporated at the conclusion of my remarks.

You will note that the University of Idaho memorandum stresses the potential benefit of the proposed quarantine station to both the cattle improvement program and efforts to improve sheep production.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation takes on added importance in view of the criticism of meat grading standards during the recent Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. If changes are made in the existing standards of meat grading, as a result of that Conference and other efforts to reduce the amount of fat in retail cuts of meat, then the benefits of the proposed quarantine station will be greatly multiplied.

This legislation is in the interests of both the livestock producer and the consumers and I strongly urge favorable action by this Committee.

(The memorandum is as follows:)

To : Dean J. E. Kraus.
From : T. Donald Bell.
Subject : Senate bill.

I am sure that you are generally familiar with the objectives of the bill in the Senate which would establish a quarantine station or stations to provide for the inspection of breeding stocks from foreign countries. Under current regulation such importation is virtually impossible, and research workers as well as the entire livestock industry are limited in their improvement program to genetic stocks now available in the United States or breeding stocks that can be filtered through Canada where they are using a quarantine system to import livestock from some of the foreign countries.

The entire beef industry, including the research agencies, are re-evaluating our cattle breeds and breeding systems in an attempt to come up with the economical production of beef cattle that are more heavily muscled, are less fat, and still have the kind of meat that is palatable to the consumer. With the emphasis on less fat it appears that some of the foreign breeds of cattle might work in very well in crossbreeding programs with our own beef breeds. A French breed, the Charolais, is being used a great deal at the present time but unfortunately with the current restrictions on importations it would appear that the quality of the cattle in the U.S. and those reaching the U.S. through Canada are inferior to those in France as well as in Canada. There are other foreign breeds that appear to have promise, but under current regulations it is impossible to bring them to the U.S. If the quarantine stations were established selected breeding stock could be brought to our country, evaluated in straight and crossbreeding programs by our research groups, and the possibility of more rapid breeding improvement would be increased by this larger genetic pool.

The problem in sheep production is of great importance at the present time, because of our changing system of production. With the increased emphasis on intensified systems of production, the ewe needs to produce more than just the single lamb that was formerly desired in our extensive range sheep operation. Under current available management and nutritional systems litters of 3 and 4 lambs would provide the efficiency needed in many segments of the sheep industry to keep our sheep men in a sound economic balance. At least one or more foreign breeds of sheep do have the characteristics of producing 3-5 lambs at each conception but unfortunately only a very limited number have ever reached this country. With the establishment of the quarantine system these foreign breeds could be imported and evaluated in straight and crossbreeding programs.

T. DONALD BELL,
College of Agriculture, University of Idaho.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. PURDY, PRESIDENT, NORTH AMERICAN LIMOUSIN
FOUNDATION, BUFFALO, WYO.

I am Robert H. Purdy, Purdy Ranches, Buffalo, Wyoming. I am engaged in the ranching business, and am presently president of the North American Limousin Foundation and a past president of the American International Charolais Association.

The principal point I would like to make in regard to the proposed U.S. Quarantine Station is that the need for this facility is far greater than most people in our own industry realize.

Cattle from countries where hoof and mouth disease and rinderpest are endemic are coming to this country through a similar facility in Canada. Our U.S.D.A. veterinarians are looking over the shoulders of the Canadian veterinarians. Greater safety would be insured by setting up our own facility. The present minimum quarantine station at Clifton, N.J., is unsatisfactory even for the over-taxed facilities presently being used for testing zoo animals that come from countries where dangerous diseases exist such as hoof and mouth and rinderpest. American cattlemen are paying millions of dollars to Canadians for these genetically superior cattle, marked up as much as ten times their cost.

At the present time there are only six Limousin bulls on the North American continent, all in Canada, whose semen is available to American cattle breeders. The cost of most of the semen from Canadian imported bulls varies from \$6.00 to \$100.00 per 1 cc. ampule of semen. At an average of 1½ ampules to breed a cow,

it means from \$9.00 to \$150.00 per calf just in semen cost, and this is for only one cross-bred calf, as there are no pure-bred Limousin females in U.S. This compares with much domestic semen at \$2.50 to \$4.00 per ampule.

The need for increased efficiency in U.S. beef production is critical if the U.S. cattle industry is to survive. This new genetic material is the quickest and best way to increase beef production and be able to maintain reasonable prices to the consumer.

I believe it is entirely possible that if such a facility were made available tomorrow, you would have applications within forty-eight hours for permits to import at least 500 head of Limousin cattle alone in the first importation. We urgently solicit your approval for a U.S. Quarantine Station, and assure you it would benefit the entire beef industry.

(Supplemental statement filed by the North American Limousin Foundation, Denver, Colo., is as follows:)

The Limousin is a breed of cattle from France that has been called by some livestock authorities, one of the most efficient beef producing animals known today. Although an ancient breed, it has been raised in a relatively isolated, hilly region somewhat like our Ozark country. As a result, it has not been widely known outside of France until the last few years.

Through the efforts of members of this organization in Canada and France, the first Limousin bull was brought into that country from France in 1967. Frozen semen from this first bull was used for limited experimental cross-breeding by artificial insemination in the United States. Other Limousin cattle were brought in last year and a sizeable importation (55 to 75 head) is expected to arrive in Canada next Spring.

Although feedlot tests and carcass evaluation is just beginning on these first Limousin-cross calves, the result of cross-breeding with our American beef and dairy cows appears to produce an exceptional types of hybrid animal.

However, because of present Canadian restrictions, it is not possible to bring purebred Limousin cattle from that country into the U.S., and livestock breeders in this nation are restricted entirely to shipments of frozen semen for experimental cross-breeding work with this breed.

Our nation is not only the largest producer of beef cattle in the world today, it is also the largest consumer of beef. Cattle production in this country is an industry that amounts to \$11 billion a year. Yet cattle prices today average slightly less than prices in 1951—although land, labor and other production costs have increased more than 125% in those 19 years.

Every cattle producer, feeder and beef processor is fighting to increase production efficiency as the only means to maintain his diminishing margin of profit.

Great strides have been made to improve feed conversion efficiency and cattle finishing methods over the past few years. Today, new techniques are also being developed to materially improve beef carcass handling and processing—particularly in the area known to the trade as the "prefabricated" carcass.

This is a new method of boning and cutting up the carcass into pre-packaged retail cuts right at the packing plant in order to reduce labor, waste and shipping costs between the slaughter point and the retailer.

Such a departure from the century-old method of shipping beef sides and quarters across the nation is creating a need for specialized types of beef animals. We will need cattle that are longer, trimmer and that can produce in one year, a finished animal weighing from 1,000 to 1,100 lbs. It must have meat that is well-marbled, yet with very little waste fat over the carcass.

To produce such cattle, we urgently need the genetic benefits of the Limousin, Simmental and other European breeds not now available to us through the Canadian Quarantine Station in sufficient quantity or at a cost that is practical.

Limousin breeding cattle now coming into Canada are being offered to American buyers at very high mark-ups. An imported heifer that cost a Canadian importer from \$2,500 to \$3,500 in France with an importation cost of \$2,000 or less, are being offered for sale in Canada—where they must be kept—for \$25,000 to \$35,000 per head.

In view of the fact that most of the Charolais cattle imported into Canada over the past four years have been sold to U.S. breeders at high prices, it appears that the Canadian Quarantine Station is based largely on the U.S. market potential for animals of this type.

Just this year, the capacity of the Canadian import facilities were increased from the previous 240 head capacity to accommodate an annual importation of 600 animals or more. This means that the Canadian facility is in effect draining large sums of dollars from the American beef cattle industry into that country every year—and the situation will soon more than double from this major increase in capacity.

The simple result is that Canada is building a valuable genetic reservoir of these new breeds while our cattle producers are unable to compete, unless they can meet current Canadian prices.

We respectfully urge this Committee to do everything in its power to affect the creation of an American Quarantine Station, so that U.S. producers can meet this future competition from other countries in the production of better and more profitable beef at a reasonable price to the American consumer.

The economic benefits of this Station to the U.S. economy would be most impressive. Out of the 35,026,400 head of cattle that were slaughtered for beef in 1968, roughly 80% were steers and heifers ranging from 15 to 30 months of age. Through the use of new genetic material and new cross-breeding techniques, it may be possible to reduce the growing and finishing time required for these slaughter cattle by as much as 3 to 12 months. In addition to this time saving, a more efficient carcass would be produced that could yield from 3% to 8% more red meat per carcass than the cattle we are now breeding.

This increased efficiency would mean a conservatively estimated net gain of \$5.00 to \$15.00 per carcass (at present wholesale beef prices of 45 cents per pound)—on these 28,000,000 or more beef steers and heifers that we kill annually. It could also produce a comparable improvement in the meat-producing quality of the 7,000,000 head of slaughter cattle in other classes, including cows and bulls that go into the various types of ground beef, canned and processed meats consumed in this nation. Such a major improvement represents a potential increase of from \$175 million to \$525 million extra income annually—without any major increase in extra cost per pound of beef to the consumer.

In addition, the type of beef carcass resulting from such a cross-breeding program has already been proved to be lower in total fat content than the U.S. Choice carcasses we are now producing from our traditional English breeds of cattle.

The growing realization that excessive animal fat in the diet can influence diseases of the human heart and arteries, make this a factor of further concern to every American also. (See the attached letter from Dr. Charles J. Wilson, of Bio-Research Associates, Inc., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.)

Because of the growing importance to the American beef industry of this new genetic material, the demand for additional research animals will surely increase. Limousin and many other breeds are necessary to improve our industry. The need for new breeds that can help to improve beef production should be a matter of concern to every American interested in our food supply.

In summary, we ask your support for a bill that would establish a maximum security Quarantine Station that could operate under the direct supervision and control of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to give full scientific protection against the introduction of disease, yet allow introduction of foreign livestock for breeding and research as needed.

We respectfully remind the Committee that the importers of such livestock would expect to pay their fair share of the expense of maintaining and operating such a facility.

(The letter referred to above is as follows:)

BIO-RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., November 12, 1969.

MR. ROBERT H. PURDY,
President, North American Limousin Foundation,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. PURDY: I understand that you will be in Washington next week, testifying in behalf of the Department of Agriculture's proposal to establish a federal quarantine station for imported cattle.

Surely you are aware of the urgent need, documented by innumerable studies of animal fats and cholesterol, to reduce the level of fat content in each cattle carcass marketed for the American consumer. These significant studies point out a definite relationship between the consumption of animal fat and those major

diseases which seriously and—all too often, fatally—affect the human heart and arteries.

The establishment of a federal quarantine station would permit entry into the United States of urgently needed new genetic material from around the world and would enable researchers to arrive at new breeding combinations designed to yield a maximum amount of protein value with a minimum amount of fat per carcass.

For this clearly important reason, I wish you well in Washington, and lend my support to your efforts and those of the Department of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. WILSON, *President*.

STATEMENT OF DR. M. R. CLARKSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) appreciates the opportunity to present its views on this important legislation. Protection of the health of the Nation's animal resources is a vital concern of the members of the veterinary medical profession.

The strains of livestock and poultry already available for breeding purposes in the United States are among the finest in the world, with considerable genetic diversity of the parent stock. Nevertheless, it is recognized that genetic material from other areas of the world would add to the vigor, increase the versatility, and enhance the efficiency of our native herds and flocks. The AVMA has not made an independent study of these needs but is aware of some of the statements made by others, notably the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The United States, in common with the other countries of North America, is free of several of the most devastating of the animal diseases that plague many areas of the world with a constant drain upon the efficiency of livestock and poultry production. Foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest are the most widespread and generally recognized as the most dangerous of these foreign animal diseases.

Rinderpest has never occurred as a disease in North America and no outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease have occurred on this continent since 1954. (The disease is believed to exist on the island of Cuba.) However, there have been a number of introductions of foot-and-mouth disease into North America from other continents—once in Mexico, once in Canada, and six times in the United States since 1900. Each outbreak has been eradicated after tremendous effort by governments, livestock owners, and others, with substantial losses and the expenditure of large amounts of money.

The six outbreaks in the United States occurred during the first 30 years of this century. During the succeeding 40 years, in spite of enormously increased trade and traffic between the United States and all countries of the world, and the occurrence of serious outbreaks in nearby Mexico, Canada and Cuba, there have been no outbreaks in the United States. This prolonged period of freedom of the United States from foot-and-mouth disease did not just "happen".

State and Federal veterinarians have maintained a vigilant watch over the movements of livestock, livestock products, and other materials that might harbor the virus of the disease. More important than this, however, was the action taken by the Congress in 1930, when strong legislative authority was given to the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent the movement into the United States of the most likely carriers of the disease, i.e., certain animals and animal products, from countries where these diseases exist. Without that legislation it is not likely that the efforts to prevent the introduction of the disease would have been effective.

For many years it has been the position of those most knowledgeable about foot-and-mouth disease that no change should be made in the controlling legislation. However, with the advancement of knowledge about the disease and the development of procedures to detect the virus in carrier animals (at the present time only in cattle), it is possible to devise procedures for the importation of carefully selected susceptible cattle from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists without introducing the disease into North America. S. 2306, if passed, would provide the basis for such importations, not only for the United States but, also, for the other countries of North America.

Current knowledge of rinderpest and the characteristics of the causative virus is sufficient to guide rigid procedures of inspection and quarantine to guard against introduction of this disease.

Mr. Chairman, the American Veterinary Medical Association supports this legislation. In doing so, we recognize that the establishment of the quarantine facilities with necessary safeguards will be an expensive undertaking and that the cost of operations will be very high. We recognize that there will be many extremely difficult problems connected with the administration of the Act. With these points in mind, we urge that the Committee report concerning the bill include the following:

1. A direction to the Department to make full use of current knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease, derived from both research and experience, and apply without deviation all necessary requirements to prevent introduction of these diseases into any part of North America.

2. A statement that access to the quarantine facility must be restricted to surface carriers. Shipment of animals by air inevitably creates problems of availability of alternate landing sites, none of which would be equipped to provide the necessary safeguards against disease transmission.

3. A provision that no animals be brought to the quarantine facility until all necessary buildings, equipment, and staff are available.

4. A direction that provision be made for the immediate destruction and disposal of all susceptible animals exposed to any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest that may occur at the quarantine station.

5. A statement that adequate measures be provided to protect against the introduction of other important communicable diseases including, but not limited to, tuberculosis, brucellosis, scabies, trichomoniasis, vibriosis, anaplasmosis, and piroplasmosis.

The State Veterinarians and the livestock industry of each of the States have a tremendous stake in the undertaking. In common with the Department, they must bear the brunt of any accident or careless handling that may occur in the administration of the proposed legislation.

It is recognized that the administration of the proposed legislation would be entirely a Department responsibility. Nevertheless, much valuable assistance may be obtained from State Veterinarians and others. The record of cooperation between the State and Federal governments in the prevention, control, and eradication of animal diseases, and the record of the Department in administering animal quarantine laws give confidence that the proposed legislation would be administered firmly and fairly. The American Veterinary Medical Association pledges its support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Omaha, Nebr., December 12, 1969.

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation,
Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR JORDAN: With this letter I wish to convey the position of the National Livestock Feeders Association relative to S. 2306 by the Honorable Roman L. Hruska. I trust the statements in these paragraphs can be included in record of the hearing held on this legislation by your Committee on December 8, 1969.

The National Livestock Feeders Association supports the passage of S. 2306 which would establish an International Quarantine Station to govern the importation of live animals from any Country in order to prevent infestation of diseases from foreign nations, and particularly to avoid bringing in foot and mouth disease.

Many of the facts relating to the necessity of such a quarantine station have been given to the Committee by the sponsor and others. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to repeat them, but this Association does wish to concur in the arguments supporting the passage of S. 2306.

A few years ago, when the United States considered cooperating with the Canadian Government so animals could eventually be brought into the United States through the Canadian Station, we viewed the operation without certain

reservations. However, the operation has been successful in protecting the United States from the importation of livestock originating in diseased areas of the world, thereby providing evidence of the practicality of a quarantine station.

Even so, it now appears to be imperative that the United States establish and operate its own quarantine control center because of the difficulty and cost of supervising the procedures at the station of another country. Also, because the Canadian Government is now prohibiting the exportation of certain breeds of cattle to the United States, which cattle have passed through the Canadian Station. At least some of these breeding cattle are very important to the improvement and progress of the domestic cattle breeding and production industry.

It seems that the United States must provide a reasonable and efficient procedure whereby breeding animals can enter the United States provided they meet the quarantine standards which would be established and are found to be safe for entry into this country. If such channels are not provided, we can be faced with attempts to circumvent our quarantine laws, and perhaps be confronted with outbreaks of diseases from animals that may be smuggled into the United States.

Outbreaks of diseases in the United States, such as foot and mouth disease, must be prevented without reservation. Not only would an outbreak amount to a lethal blow to the economy of the domestic cattle industry, but it would have a devastating effect upon the food supply of the American people. Needless to say, the consequences of such outbreaks would have even more far-reaching effects upon American business and American consumers.

With these views in mind, we trust the Committee and the Congress will act favorably on S. 2306, and also that there can be action as soon as possible so this exceedingly important protective station will be established.

Respectfully yours,

DON F. MAGDANZ,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 91-239
S. 2306

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 2306.....	1
-----------------------------------	---

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2306

June 3, 1969 Rep. Purcell introduced H. R. 11832 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.

June 5, 1969 Sen. Hruska introduced and discussed S. 2306, which was referred to Senate Finance Committee. Bill was rereferred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as rereferred and remarks of author.

Nov. 19, 1969 House Agriculture subcommittee approved H. R. 11832 for full committee consideration.

Dec. 4, 1969 House committee voted to report H. R. 11832.

Dec. 19, 1969 House committee reported H. R. 11832 with amendments. H. Rept. 91-776. Print of bill and report.

Jan. 28, 1970 Senate committee reported S. 2306 with amendment. S. Rept. 91-638. Print of bill and report.

Jan. 30, 1970 Senate passed S. 2306 as reported.

Mar. 3, 1970 Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 11832. R. Res. 861 and H. Rept. 91-861. Print of resolution in Congressional Proceedings.

Mar. 4, 1970 House passed H. R. 11832 then passed S. 2306 with an amendment to substitute the language of H. R. 11832. H. R. 11832 was tabled due to passage of S. 2306.

Apr. 6, 1970 Senate concurred to House amendment with an amendment.

Apr. 23, 1970 House concurred in Senate amendment.

May 6, 1970 Approved: Public Law 91-239.

House Agriculture Committee Hearing on H. R. 11832.

Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee Hearing on S. 2306.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11832

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 3, 1969

Mr. PURCELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his dis-
4 cretion, to establish and maintain an international animal
5 quarantine station within the territory of the United States.
6 The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected
7 by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, max-
8 imum animal disease and pest security measures can be

1 maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to
2 acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation,
3 exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings,
4 improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for
5 the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine sta-
6 tion. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to
7 prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or
8 poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the
9 quarantine station from any country, including but not
10 limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agri-
11 culture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease
12 exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United
13 States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary
14 of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to pre-
15 vent the introduction into and the dissemination within the
16 United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The
17 Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such
18 manner as he deems appropriate, with other North Amer-
19 ican countries or with breeders' organizations or similar
20 organizations or with individuals within the United States
21 regarding importation of animals into and through the quar-
22 antine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for
23 use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such
24 fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States
25 to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating

1 expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is author-
2 ized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry
3 out the provisions of this Act.

4 SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of
5 title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of
6 animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent move-
7 ment of animals to other parts of the United States contrary
8 to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations
9 issued hereunder.

10 SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of
12 this Act.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 11832

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PURCELL

JUNE 3, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2306

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 5, 1969

Mr. HRUSKA introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

JUNE 24, 1969

The Committee on Finance discharged, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discre-
4 tion, to establish and maintain an international animal quar-
5 antine station within the territory of the United States. The
6 quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by
7 the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maxi-
8 mum animal disease and pest security measures can be main-

1 tained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire
2 land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange,
3 or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements,
4 and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment
5 and maintenance of such quarantine station. Notwithstanding
6 the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or
7 dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals
8 may be brought into the quarantine station from any coun-
9 try, including, but not limited to, those countries in which the
10 Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-
11 and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other
12 parts of the United States, in accordance with such condi-
13 tions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are ade-
14 quate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dis-
15 semination within the United States of livestock or poultry
16 diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized
17 to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with
18 other North American countries or with breeders' organiza-
19 tions or similar organizations or with individuals within the
20 United States regarding importation of animals into and
21 through the quarantine station and to charge and collect
22 reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from
23 importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury
24 of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged
25 with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The

1 Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems
2 necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

3 SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of
4 title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of
5 animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent move-
6 ment of animals to other parts of the United States contrary
7 to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations
8 issued hereunder.

9 SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
10 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of
11 this Act.

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HRUSKA

JUNE 5, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

JUNE 24, 1969

The Committee on Finance discharged; and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 2307. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; and

S. 2308. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to \$100 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2309. A bill to establish the Amistad National Recreation Area in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2310. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GURNEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2311. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1937, to provide for a program of Federal financial assistance to establish hunter safety programs in the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for Mr. CASE) (for himself, Mr. GRAVEL, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2312. A bill to establish a Department of Conservation and the Environment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2313. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HATFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2314. A bill to amend section 4 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands relating to voting age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 2315. A bill to restore the "Golden Eagle" program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2316. A bill for the relief of Prakong Chotsiri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 2317. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the advancement of certain former members of the Armed Forces on the retired lists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 2318. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Soriano Mauban;

S. 2319. A bill for the relief of Prof. Anthony D'Souza;

S. 2320. A bill for the relief of Abdollah Rahmatian; and

S. 2321. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel

M. Mendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

S. 2322. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 2323. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 079626); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCGEE (by request):

S. 2324. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308, relating to the Government Employees Training Act of 1958;

S. 2325. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18; and

S. 2326. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCGEE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. TOWER):

S. 2327. A bill to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; and

S. 2329. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to relinquish and quitclaim any title it may heretofore claim to certain lands situated in the county of San Bernardino, State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURPHY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2330. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yilmaz Zebes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2331. A bill to continue in effect the unified system of annual and user fees for Federal recreation areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2332. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the rendition by justices and judges of the United States of certain personal services for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2333. A bill for the relief of Mamerto C. Comia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Yim Wan Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2335. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the Interstate Compact on Juveniles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 2336. A bill relating to the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal

Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. THURMOND):

S.J. Res. 118. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 119. A joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the U.S. section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2306—INTRODUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK QUARANTINE STATION ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill entitled the "International Livestock Quarantine Station Act," and ask that it be appropriately referred. It provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to establish and operate an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States, and, in connection with the station, permits the movement of animals into the United States which would otherwise be prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws.

Every necessary protection for our livestock is contained in this proposal. First, the quarantine station must be located on an island carefully selected by the Department of Agriculture to permit the maintenance of maximum animal disease and pest security measures. Second, under the act movements of the imported livestock to other parts of the United States must be done in accordance with conditions determined by the Department of Agriculture to be adequate to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign countries.

The Tariff Act of 1930 contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of all livestock and all fresh, chilled or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by the department to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. An exception is made for wild zoo animals, which can be imported under very stringent restrictions.

The prohibition of the Tariff Act would remain in effect for all importations of livestock except those that pass through the international quarantine station under the restrictions imposed by the Department of Agriculture.

The construction and operation of a quarantine station adequate to prevent the introduction of livestock diseases from foreign countries will be difficult, but it certainly can be done. Other countries of the world, notably Canada, have similar quarantine stations which have operated effectively.

The Canadian Government has two animal quarantine stations, one at St. John's and one at Grosse Ile. When animals are imported into Canada from

countries with continuous affliction, such as France, the animals must pass through a strict procedure of maximum security. No animal carrying foot-and-mouth disease has ever been released from these centers.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has been working closely with the Canadian Government in the animal supervision and testing at the Canadian stations. Much has been learned. In order to continue using the Canadian experience to fullest advantage, the International Livestock Quarantine Station Act would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate, with other North American countries, as well as with individuals, breeders' organizations or similar organizations within the United States, regarding importation of animals.

The Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has carefully studied this matter and has determined that an international livestock quarantine station is feasible and desirable.

Among the reasons cited by the ARS to explain why an international livestock quarantine station is needed are the following:

First. Livestock products, particularly beef, are in high demand by consumers.

Second. Consumer desires in meat and milk are changing. There is interest in less fat but high content of other desirable nutrients.

Third. Producers are under stress from high production costs and they need to find ways to reduce costs, and to increase efficiency and returns.

Fourth. The nature of production makes it difficult for producers to adjust quickly and to respond to consumer desires by patterning products to meet those consumer desires.

Fifth. Opportunities to adjust production practices, types of animals, and product characteristics are limited and require time.

Sixth. One important course of action is to breed and develop animals which are more productive and which can efficiently produce more desirable products.

Seventh. The genetic base of some classes of livestock now available in the United States is narrow. It is based on only a few of the many breeds of the world. In some cases our present breeds are based on a relatively few animals introduced from northern Europe 60 to 80 years ago.

Eighth. Science has demonstrated high potential of crossbreeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in production. In some cases it can also bring about, more rapidly than any other breeding procedure, changes in the character and composition of the product.

Ninth. Science has further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossing the greater the benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics.

Tenth. Exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world introduced in the United States has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal new varieties of high-yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in every day use on farms and ranches.

Eleventh. Observations and preliminary investigations suggest that potential benefits are probable in livestock, especially the meat-producing species, in the order of magnitude observed with crops through the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals.

Twelfth. The use of certain exotic breeds likely can bring about desirable changes much faster than the same changes could be achieved within present United States breeds through long years of selection.

Thirteenth. The United States needs to provide a safe, orderly way to make the world's livestock population available for use in improving its livestock and livestock products.

The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals can be expected to promote more rapid growth of livestock and enable producers to market them sooner. Some of the improvements in livestock production would include beef cattle—an increase in weaning weight, postweaning growth rates, and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival; dairy cattle—an increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival; sheep—an increase in lambing rate, lamb growth rate and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and swine—an increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

While seeking to achieve the benefits that can be derived from new livestock blood lines, the Department of Agriculture's primary responsibility under the act will continue to be the prevention of livestock and poultry diseases and pests gaining entry from foreign countries. The importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries must not be done at the risk of introducing diseases and pests not now present in this country. Both objectives can be obtained by this establishment of an international animal quarantine station under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The International Livestock Quarantine Station Act would require appropriations of approximately \$5.5 million exclusive of any costs which may be involved for land acquisition. Of this total amount, approximately \$4.2 million would be on a nonrecurring basis for the construction of facilities, and \$1.3 million for initial operating expenses. After the first year, however, it is expected that expenses for operating the quarantine station would be financed largely by the collection of fees from importers.

These costs are very reasonable when compared to the possible benefits. On the basis of available information, the ARS has estimated that the year 1980 and thereafter annual benefits to the livestock producers and the public could amount to from \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion.

On October 11, 1968, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate entitled, "Quarantine Center for Livestock Imports Into United States." I concluded those remarks by stating:

Mr. President, in an age when population growth of our Nation and of the world requires a constantly increasing demand on protein sources for healthy people, and when America is so blessed with a livestock industry capable of meeting the needs of our people with the greatest source of high protein meats and dairy products, which are a luxury and unattainable commodity in many lands, we must provide that industry with the necessary new blood lines to improve its livestock, but, on the other hand, we cannot, and we must not expose this great industry to, and must protect it from all risks of this smallest of virus which could cause the greatest of tragedies.

A quarantine center owned and operated by the United States for all livestock imports from diseased areas of the world would be an ideal solution.

I stand by that conclusion.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the bill I introduce today be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2306), to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2306

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Sec-

retary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 2. The provisions and penalties of 18 U.S.C. 545 shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 2309—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE AMISTAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA,

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce today, for the appropriate reference, a measure to establish the Amistad National Recreation Area in the State of Texas along its border with the Republic of Mexico. The establishment of this area will be a fitting monument to the great deeds of the Amistad Treaty with Mexico and will further the purposes for which the treaty was consummated: Amistad—in English “friendship”—is the State motto of Texas and it is fitting that the area along the border with our sister republic should be so named.

Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, a companion to this bill was cleared by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; unfortunately, however, it was cleared too late for any floor action. The interests of our Nation in furthering its most important relations with the Mexican Republic will be greatly served by approval of this measure. The State of Texas and the Nation will be served by the preservation for recreation, hunting, and camping of some of the most ruggedly beautiful areas remaining. It is certainly my hope that the Senate Committee on the Interior will give quick approval to the measure, and likewise the entire Senate, so that the acquisition of the site may be started and the area preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2309) to establish the Amistad National Recreation Area in the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2310—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION UPON THE AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE INCOME WHICH AN INDIVIDUAL MAY EARN WHILE RECEIVING BENEFITS UNDER TITLE II, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to completely eliminate the income limitation placed on social security recipients.

Our social security system was never intended to be the sole means of support for all retirees. It was designed to supplement other retirement plans, and to round out the income from savings and whatever other financial preparations a person may have made for his retirement years.

Our older Americans are finding it more and more difficult to make ends meet in view of our present high cost of living and inflation. To meet their financial obligations, many social security recipients find it necessary to hold full-time and part-time jobs to supplement their social security pensions. Of the more than 18 million Americans over the age of 65, over 3 million are productively employed.

Under existing law, these recipients are restricted to \$140 a month in earnings. For every \$2 earned above \$1,680, they lose \$1 in benefits. Beyond \$2,880 all social security benefits are lost. It is wrong to penalize these people who want to work and keep from them social security benefits toward which they have contributed for years.

These retirees are not asking for a free ride. They merely want a chance to help themselves. By lifting the outside income limits on these recipients, we can give them that chance.

It should be remembered that this \$1,680 limit only applies to those who add additional income to their social security benefits through wages. There is no limit on the amount a senior citizen can earn through dividends, investments, and property. This has resulted in the strange paradox of millionaires drawing full social security benefits while many who cannot subsist on the benefits must continue to work and forfeit their social security benefits.

I am hopeful that the 91st Congress will take early action to ease the plight of the beleaguered retiree, and at least allow him to help himself, by enacting this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2310) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. GURNEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2311—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR A PROGRAM OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ESTABLISH HUNTER SAFETY PROGRAMS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal financial assistance for State hunter safety and wildlife conservation programs.

At the present time, the Federal Government levies two taxes on firearms. The first tax, on arms and ammunition, currently brings in \$37 million a year. These funds go directly into the Department of the Interior's wildlife restoration fund. The second tax, on pistols and revolvers, brings in approximately \$4.7 million yearly. This money now goes into the General Federal Treasury. My bill would channel this revolver and pistol tax directly into the wildlife restoration fund, thus providing additional revenue for worthwhile projects.

The Department of the Interior's wildlife restoration fund provides money for

State wildlife preservation and game management programs. Under my bill, the wildlife restoration fund would distribute the additional pistol and revolver tax revenue to the States. Each State would have the option of using the entire amount for wildlife conservation, or up to half of the new funds in hunter safety programs and the rest in wildlife conservation projects.

Pennsylvania has long been one of the leaders in wildlife conservation programs. Last year, the Commonwealth received \$1.2 million from the Department of the Interior's wildlife restoration fund for its food and cover and farm game project. These funds were used in Pennsylvania to build small marshes, improve access to private and public game lands, and arrange for constant game feeding in forest areas. Wildlife restoration fund money also financed studies of the ring necked pheasant, the wild turkey, and the white tail deer. These studies will help insure a continuous supply of game for State outdoorsmen. Other States have used wildlife restoration fund money for land acquisition, wildlife habitat control, and game husbandry research. My bill would provide an additional source of revenue to finance more of these worthy wildlife restoration projects. Sportsmen pay the tax on pistols and revolvers. They deserve to derive the benefit. This is what my bill would accomplish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2311) to amend the act of September 2, 1937, to provide for a program of Federal financial assistance to establish hunter safety programs in the several States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2312—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Senator CASE of New Jersey, is necessarily absent from the Senate today and on his behalf I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create a Department of Conservation and the Environment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD and that a statement by Senator CASE accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2312) to establish a Department of Conservation and the Environment, introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for Mr. CASE for himself, Mr. GRAVEL, and Mr. MOSS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2312

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

this Act may be cited as the "Department of Conservation and the Environment Act".

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Nation that the safety and general welfare of the people require that the environment of the earth on which we live must be protected; that the people have a right to the preservation of their neighborhoods and communities; to the enjoyment of natural areas and the wildlife indigenous thereto; and to the wise and prudent use of all natural resources for the benefit of existing and future generations.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 101. There is hereby established at the seat of government as an executive department of the United States Government, the Department of Conservation and the Environment (hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Department").

SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established within the Department a Federal Air and Water Resources Administration; a Federal Land Resources Administration; and a Federal Parks and Recreation Administration. Each of these components shall be headed by an Administrator. The Administrators shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In addition to such functions, powers, and duties as are specified in this Act to be carried out by the Administrators, the Administrators shall carry out such additional functions, powers, and duties, as the Secretary may prescribe. Each Administrator shall report directly to an Assistant Secretary. The functions, powers, and duties specified in this Act to be carried out by each Administrator shall not be transferred elsewhere in the Department unless specifically provided for by reorganization plan submitted pursuant to statute.

(b)(1) The Federal Air and Water Resources Administrator shall carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary transferred to him pursuant to subsection (a) and paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this title.

(2) The Federal Land Resources Administrator shall carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary transferred to him pursuant to paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (12) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this title.

(3) The Federal Parks and Recreation Administrator shall carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary transferred to him pursuant to paragraphs (9), (10), (11), and (13) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this title.

PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 103. (a) There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Conservation and the Environment (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Conservation and the Environment who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Under Secretary of Conservation and the Environment (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary of Conservation and the Environment or the General Counsel, determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act for, and exercise the powers of the Secretary, during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary. The Under Secretary shall have the responsibility of approving all civil work projects of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, and shall perform

such other functions as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time.

(c) There shall be in the Department four Assistant Secretaries of Conservation and the Environment and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time.

(d) There shall be in the Department three Administrators, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such functions as are prescribed by this Act and as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and prescribe their functions and duties, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and functions of this Act.

(f) The Secretary may obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 104. (a) The functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.), the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 3251), and all other air pollution control functions of such Secretary are transferred to the Secretary of Conservation and the Environment.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary all functions which were carried out immediately before the effective date of this title—

(1)(A) by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Administration;

(2)(A) by the Environmental Science Services Administration, Department of Commerce; or

(B) by the Secretary of Commerce, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Administration;

(3)(A) by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Bureau;

(4)(A) by the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; or

(B) by the Secretary of Agriculture, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Service.

(5)(A) by the Office of Noise Abatement, Department of Transportation; or

(B) by the Secretary of Transportation, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Office.

(6)(A) by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Bureau.

(7)(A) by the Bureau of Mines (except with respect to oil and gas), Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Bureau.

(8)(A) by the Geological Survey (except with respect to oil and gas), Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions

transferred under this paragraph from such Survey.

(9)(A) by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Service.

(10)(A) by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Bureau.

(11)(A) by the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, Department of the Interior; or

(B) by the Secretary of the Interior, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Bureau.

(12)(A) by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; or

(B) by the Secretary of Agriculture, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Service.

(13)(A) by the Office of the Highway Beautification Coordinator, Department of Transportation; or

(B) by the Secretary of Transportation, insofar as the functions relate to functions transferred under this paragraph from such Office.

(e) In addition to the functions specifically transferred to the Secretary by this title, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary, except to the extent otherwise specifically provided by this Act, all functions which were carried out immediately before the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of the Interior, including all functions of the Secretary of the Interior being administered by him through an agency, service, bureau, office, board, administration, or other entity of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 105. (a) There is hereby established within the Department the Council of Environmental Advisers, which shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the President of the United States from individuals in private life who by virtue of their experience or training are specially qualified to serve on the Council.

(b) Members of the Council of Environmental Advisers shall be appointed for terms of three years; except that, of the members first appointed, three shall be appointed for a term of one year, three for a term of two years, and three for a term of three years.

(c) The Council of Environmental Advisers may employ a staff to be headed by an executive director. The executive director, subject to the discretion of the Chairman, is authorized to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of such title, and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Any vacancy in the Council of Environmental Advisers shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) The President shall designate one of the members of the Council to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman.

(f) The members of the Council of Environmental Advisers shall each receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the

INDEX of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Nov. 19, 1969
91st-1st; No. 191

CONTENTS

Agricultural	Legislative program.....14	Retirement.....25
Appropriations.....1,6	Military construction....11	Reorganization.....16
Pollution.....24	Pay comparability.....19	Research.....33,35
Malachia.....7	Personnel.....19	Rhodesia.....12
Al reefs.....23	Pollution.....3,17,24,27,31	Salaries.....19
Education.....22	Potatoes.....13	Science.....35
Environment.....4,21,22,32	Poverty.....5	Selective service.....2
Foreign aid.....8	Public works.....7	Subsidy payments.....6
Foreign trade.....15,26	Quarantine station.....10	Tule elk.....20
Great Plains.....34	Recreation.....18	Water.....3,17,27,31
Islands.....29,30	Redwoods.....28	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on agricultural appropriations
1. House concluded general debate on foreign aid bill. House subcommittee
approved international quarantine station bill.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Both Houses (House, 214-172) agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11612, the agricultural appropriations bill, 1970, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. H11082-91, S14673-80). See Digest 190 for a table reflecting the changes agreed upon by the conferees.
2. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Passed without amendment H. R. 14001, to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to authorize modifications of the system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces (pp. S14632-41). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. POLLUTION. Sen. Gore criticized failure to place pollution from electric power generating plants in proper perspective. pp. S14613-4
4. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Nelson inserted an editorial, "What Can Be Done About This Horror Picture That We Are Making Out of Our Environment?" pp. S14614-5
Sen. Moss inserted an advertisement, "Now Is the Time for All Good Men to Come to the Aid of Their Planet." pp. S14615-6
Sen. Tydings inserted his testimony regarding the proposed nuclear power plant at Calvert Cliffs, Md., in which he spoke in support of his bill to require certification, consistent with established water quality standards, of permits required for water withdrawals affected with a federal interest. pp. S14618-28
5. POVERTY. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., commended Summerville, W. Va., for turning the tables on poverty and inserted flattering articles. pp. S14628-9

HOUSE

6. SUBSIDY PAYMENTS. Reps. Findley and Conte expressed concern that the subsidy payments limitation was deleted from the agricultural appropriations bill. pp. H11073, H11073-4
7. APPALACHIA. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1072, to provide for the renewal and extension of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H11074-82
8. FEDERAL AID. The Government Operations Committee reported H. R. 14517, to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects (H. Rept. 91-659). p. H11173
9. FOREIGN AID. Concluded general debate on H. R. 14580, the foreign aid bill. The resolution for consideration of the bill was agreed to earlier. pp. H11096-132
10. QUARANTINE STATION. A Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 11832, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station. p. D1092

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of December 4, 1969
91st-1st No. 200

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....29	Health.....3,6,10,15	National park.....5
Agricultural appropriation	Health services.....10,23	Nutrition.....3
.....21	Highways.....44	Patent treaty.....13
Appropriations.....1,21,24	Housing.....19	Personnel.....40
Assistant Secretary.....46	Hunger.....36	Population.....1,26
Budget cutbacks.....23	Indians.....22	Poverty.....7,27
Child protection.....31	Inflation.....30	Public works.....24
Costal zone.....41	Information.....49	Quarantine station.....9
Consumers.....42	Interest rates.....45,48	Refrigerators.....47
Desertland entrymen.....12	Intergovernmental relations	Safety.....31,47
Environment.....4,8,25,3314	Social security.....16
Export control.....38	Legislative program.....28	Subsidy payments.....21
FHA loans.....20	Libby Dam.....43	Tariff.....17
Farmworkers.....10	Loans.....20	Taxation.....2,32
Fertilizer.....39	Lumber.....35	Urban affairs.....37
Foods.....3	Mexican-Americans.....11	Veterinarians.....15
Foreign trade.....17	Migrant workers.....10	Water quality.....18
Forestry.....35	Mortgages.....34	

Highlights: Rep. Whitten defended congressional action on agricultural appropriations bill. House committee voted to report international quarantine station bill. House committee voted to report migrant agricultural workers health services bill. Senate passed continuing appropriations resolution.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received and agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14159, the public works appropriations bill, 1970. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S15594-610
Received from the President a proposed supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1970 for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (H. Doc. 91-44); to the Appropriations Committee. p. S15610
Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 1017, to further continue appropriations for fiscal year 1970 until sine die adjournment. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. S15678-9
2. TAX REFORM. Continued debate on H. R. 13270, the tax reform bill. pp. S15621-23, 15645-49, 15674-700, 15702-37.
3. FOOD; NUTRITION; HEALTH. Sen. Kennedy noted that Dec. 4 marked the last day of the three day White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, and he inserted an address delivered by Sen. Mondale at the conference. pp. S15623-4.
4. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Spong remarked that "the costs of misusing the environment ultimately are unavoidable" and inserted a newspaper article on ecology. pp. S15625-26
5. NATIONAL PARKS. Sen. Yarbrough lamented the shrinkage of the Big Thicket from 3.5 million acres to 300,000 acres, and urged establishment of a 100,000 acre Big Thicket National Park; he inserted articles supporting action on the park. p. S15625
6. HEALTH. Sen. Kennedy reviewed the health budget crisis and complimented the work of regional medical programs; inserted articles on program action. pp. S15635-39

HOUSE - Dec. 3 continued

7. POVERTY PROGRAM. Several Representatives continued to discuss the scheduling of consideration of proposed legislation to extend the Economic Opportunity Act programs. pp. H11835-42
8. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Saylor spoke on the awareness of the nation's youth to the needs of our ecological system. pp. H11850-6
Rep. Monagan told of the successful completion of a water purification system in Conn., which will neutralize acids, remove waste oils and eliminate solid materials. p. H11861

HOUSE - Dec. 4

9. QUARANTINE STATION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11832 amended, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station. p. D1155

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Dec. 18 continued, 19, & 20, 1969
91st-1st No. 213 and No. 212

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....25	Federal Executive Institute.....56	Pesticides.....13
Adjournment.....20,38	FHA loans.....57	Pollution.....37
Alligator.....62	Flood control.....10,15,43	Poverty.....3,17,45
Appropriations.....4,6,7,10,15,16,19,27,31,59	Food additives.....44	Quarantine station.....2
Boat safety.....14	Food stamps.....24,54	Regional planning.....67
Clean air.....58	Foreign aid.....4,16,28	SCS.....10,15
Consumers.....1,61	Foreign trade.....12,39,53	Small business.....35
Corporation farming.....34	Freight cars.....52,63	Soil conservation.....23
Daylight time.....50	Grain.....52	Supergrades.....8,33
Disaster relief.....10,15	Hunger.....40	Supplemental appropriations.....10,15
Electrification.....46	Imports.....39,53	Taxation.....5,19,21,55
Environment.....13,18,32,37,41,49,58,64	Legislative program.....19	Transportation.....7,27
Farm committees.....22	Manpower.....30	Urban development.....47
Farm income.....21	Migrant workers.....29	Water conservation.....23
Farm labor.....29	Military construction.....6,27	Watersheds.....11,65
Farm program.....26	Mortgage credit.....9	Wheat.....25
Farm subsidies.....48	National forests.....36,60	Youth Conservation Corps...66
Federal aid.....51	Opinion poll.....42	
	Personnel.....8,33	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on foreign aid authorizations bill. Senate passed migrant workers health bill. House committee reported international quarantine station bill. House passed additional supergrades bill. Senate passed additional supergrades bill. Senate agreed to conference report on environmental quality bill. House received conference report on supplemental appropriations bill.

HOUSE December 19, 1969

1. CONSUMERS. Received from the Government Operations Committee a report "Government rejected consumer items (17th report)" (H. Rept. 91-773).
p. H12837
2. QUARANTINE STATIONS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11832, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the U. S. for purposes of improving livestock (H. Rept. 91-776).
p. H12837
3. POVERTY. Received the conference report on S. 3016, to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs (H. Rept. 91-778).
pp. H12817-22
4. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses agreed, (House, 208-166) to the conference report on H. R. 14580, the foreign aid authorization bill (pp. H12795-7, S17301-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Received the conference report on H. R. 15149, the foreign aid appropriation bill, 1970 (H. Rept. 91-779). pp. H12834-6
5. TAXATION. Granted until midnight Sunday, Dec. 21, to file a conference report on H. R. 13270, the tax reform bill of 1969. pp. H12791-3
6. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14751, the military construction appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1970. pp. H12793-5
7. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14794, Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriation bill, 1970.
pp. H12797-8
8. SUPERGRADES; PERSONNEL. Passed as reported S. 2325, to amend title 5, U. S. Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18.
pp. H12798-12800
9. MORTGAGE CREDIT. Both Houses agreed (House, 358-4) to the conference report on S. 2577, to provide additional mortgage credit (pp. S17299-301, H12812-17). This bill will now be sent to the President.
10. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 15209, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1970 (p. H12822). Senate conferees have been appointed.
11. WATERSHEDS. Rep. Edwards, Ala., expressed hope the Administration will back the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project. p. H12790
12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Molloy called on the Congress in the next session to "carefully consider" our foreign trade commitments. p. H12807

ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION

DECEMBER 19, 1969.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. POAGE, from the Committee on Agriculture,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11832]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 11832) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence:

The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act.

Page 3, line 7, strike the word "contrary" and strike all of lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the words "including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate an international quarantine station on an island near the continental United States. Department of Agriculture witnesses informed the committee that the most likely site for this quarantine station would be off the southeast coast of the United States in the Caribbean area. The establishment of the proposed quarantine station would permit the movement into the United States of animals which are otherwise prohibited or restricted because of general animal quarantine laws. Under this bill the movement of cov-

ered animals to other parts of the United States would be prohibited unless this movement was made in accordance with terms and conditions established by the Secretary to prevent the introduction or spread of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign nations.

In order to finance the proposed quarantine station, the bill would also authorize the Secretary to acquire the necessary real property by purchase, donation, or exchange and to obtain needed personal property, buildings, improvements, or other facilities by private donations, as well as to charge and collect reasonable fees for the use of the station by importers of livestock. In addition, the bill authorizes the annual appropriation of such public funds that may be needed.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The committee feels that the expected benefits to the domestic livestock industry and to the consuming public would more than offset any immediate costs incurred in the construction and operation of this needed facility.

While the protection of the domestic livestock population from infectious diseases is an important and continuing responsibility, the committee feels that it is also very important to make available to the American livestock industry the breeding lines of various foreign animals in order to improve the quality of domestically produced livestock products. Research has already shown that crossbreeding between domestic and foreign animals can increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in our livestock industry. This genetic advantage would of course ultimately inure to the benefit of the consumer of livestock products. This benefit would be in the form of a higher quality and more efficiently produced product.

Some of the anticipated improvements in livestock production include the following:

First, beef cattle—An increase in weaning weight, in postweaning growth rates, and in muscularity; a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival;

Second, dairy cattle—An increase in milk production fertility, and calf survival;

Third, sheep—An increase in lambing rate, in lamb growth, and in muscularity; and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and

Fourth, swine—An increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

The justification for this facility therefore rests more in its long-range benefit to the consuming public than it does in its obvious and more immediate assistance to the domestic livestock industry.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

This legislation was unanimously reported by both the full committee and the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee which held open hearings on H.R. 11832 by Mr. Purcell, H.R. 12028 by Mr. Price of Texas, H.R. 13336 by Mr. Miller of Ohio, H.R. 14451 by Mr. Foley, and H.R. 14847 by Mr. Mayne on November 18 and 19, 1969.

There was no opposition expressed to the bill at the hearings, but both the United States Animal Health Association and the American

Veterinary Medical Association expressed their concern that this facility be operated under the highest animal health standards and with the necessary safeguards which will maintain the excellent record of disease prevention and control that the Nation presently enjoys.

It is therefore the committee's intent that:

1. The Secretary should make full use of current knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease, derived from both research and experience, and apply without deviation all necessary requirements to prevent the introduction of these diseases into any part of North America.

2. Access to the quarantine facility should, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, be restricted to surface carriers. The committee recognizes that shipment of animals by air inevitably creates problems of availability of alternate landing sites, some of which would not be equipped to provide the necessary safeguards against disease transmission and urges the Secretary to carefully use his authority on this matter.

3. No animals should be brought to the quarantine facility until all necessary buildings, equipment, and staff are available.

4. Provisions should be made by the Secretary for the **immediate** destruction and disposal of all susceptible animals exposed to any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest that may occur at the quarantine station.

5. Adequate measures should be provided by the Secretary to protect against the introduction of other important communicable diseases including, but not limited to, tuberculosis, brucellosis, scabies, trichomoniasis, vibriosis, anaplasmosis, and piroplasmosis. The Secretary should also give consideration to appropriate methods of controlling the dissemination of diseases by birds which might carry some of these diseases to the mainland.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted two amendments. The *first* is the amendment by the administration. It deals with the acceptance by the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, of any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this legislation.

During the consideration of the bill several members of the committee expressed their concern that the proposed amendment might place the Secretary, who has a vital regulatory responsibility, in a difficult administrative position, especially if the gifts the United States Government received were from individuals or groups who had an interest in obtaining improved foreign breeding stock through the quarantine facilities.

A majority of the committee, however, approved the Administration amendment with confidence in and direction to the Secretary that the department will not show any favoritism or preferential treatment to any prospective donors of personal property. The committee also intends this policy to apply to any donors of real property and to livestock importers who are charged fees as well. Also, the committee feels that the amendment, with appropriate administrative action, would reduce the cost of the proposed quarantine facility and thereby reduce the amount of public money needed from appropriations supplied by the Congress.

In preparing for its decision on the Administration amendment the committee received from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress the following memorandum covering the authority of government departments and agencies to accept property by gift:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., December 3, 1969.

To: House Committee on Agriculture; attention of Mr. Murray.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Authority of Government departments and agencies to accept property by gift.

Reference is made to your letter presenting three questions under the above captioned subject matter. Your questions and our answers thereto are as follows:

1. *What is the general statutory authority for the acceptance of gifts from private persons, corporations, foundations, States, or other donors?*

No general statutory authority for the acceptance of gifts from private persons, etc., by governmental agencies can be located. We interpret the term "general statutory authority" to mean generally, a grant of authority by Congress to all departments and agencies of the government to accept all types of property as an aid in carrying out their functions as authorized by law. There are many instances of conferral of authority in this area to specific departments and agencies. Examples of this are shown under your question 3 below.

2. *What specific authority, if any, does the Secretary of Agriculture have under present law to accept such gifts in behalf of the United States?*

No specific authority for the acceptance of gifts and bequests for purposes of the Department such as, for example, that conferred on the Department of Commerce under 15 U.S.C. section 1522 is found. Citations to conferrals of authority by Congress on numerous agencies of the government for specific purposes are collected in the index to the U.S. Code under the heading "Gifts." (See also "United States—Gifts to Government"). An examination of those citations and others relating to the Department of Agriculture discloses no conferral of authority on the Secretary of Agriculture to accept property by way of gift.

3. *What examples can you find of other governmental agencies having specific authority to accept such gifts?*

As stated above, citations to pertinent provisions of the U.S. Code appear to be collected under the index heading of "Gifts". These citations are many in number and for that reason we have concluded to present brief summaries of provisions relating to the authority of selected departments and agencies in certain areas:

(1) ARMED FORCES

General gift funds

"The Secretary concerned may accept, hold, administer, and spend any gift, devise or bequest of real or personal property, made on the condition that it be used for the benefit, or in connection with the

establishment, operation, or maintenance, of a school, hospital, library, museum, cemetery, or other institution or organization under the jurisdiction of his department. He may pay all necessary expenses in connection with the conveyance or transfer of a gift, devise, or bequest made under this subsection." (10 U.S.C. 2601.)

(2) SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Acceptance of donations: land for mobilization, training, supply base, or aviation field

"The Secretary of the Army may accept for the United States a gift of—

"(1) land that he considers suitable and desirable for a permanent mobilization, training, or supply station; and

"(2) land that he considers suitable and desirable for an aviation field, if the gift is from a citizen of the United States and its terms authorize the use of the property by the United States for any purpose." (10 U.S.C. 4771.)

(3) SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Gifts for welfare of enlisted members

"The Secretary of the Navy may accept gifts for use in providing recreation, amusement, and contentment for enlisted members of the naval service." (10 U.S.C. 7220.)

Acceptance and care of gifts to vessels

"The Secretary of the Navy may accept and care for such gifts of silver, colors, books, or other articles of equipment or furniture as, in accordance with custom, are made to vessels of the Navy." (10 U.S.C. 7221.)

Office of Naval Records and History gift fund

"The Secretary of the Navy may accept, hold, and administer gifts and bequests of personal property, and loans of personal property other than money, for the benefit of the Office of Naval Records and History, its collection, or its services." (10 U.S.C. 7222.)

(4) SECRETARY OF STATE

Acceptance of gifts on behalf of the United States

"The Secretary of State may accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for the benefit of the Department including the Service or for the carrying out of any of its functions. Conditional gifts may be so accepted at the discretion of the Secretary, and the principal of and income from any such conditional gift shall be held, invested, reinvested, and used in accordance with its conditions but no gift shall be accepted which is conditioned upon any expenditure not to be met therefrom or from the income thereof unless such expenditure has been approved by Act of Congress." (22 U.S.C. 809.)

(5) SECRETARY OF TREASURY

Acceptance by Treasurer of gifts and bequests of Government securities

"Whenever any direct obligation of the United States, bearing interest or sold on a discount basis is donated to the United States, is bequeathed by will to the United States, become the property of the United States under the terms of a trust, or is by its terms payable upon the death of the owner to the United States or any officer thereof in his official capacity, the Treasurer of the United States upon receipt of such obligation shall effect redemption thereof. If under applicable law such gift, bequest, or other transfer to the United States is subject to a gift or inheritance tax, the Treasurer shall pay such tax out of the proceeds of redemption and shall deposit the balance in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts or as otherwise authorized by law. If no tax is payable the entire proceeds shall be so deposited." (31 U.S.C. 757e.)

*Gifts for reduction of public debt**Acceptance authority; conditions; rejection*

"In order to afford to the people of the United States an opportunity to make gifts to the Government of the United States to be used for the purpose of reducing the public debt—

"(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States (1) any gift of money made on the sole condition that it be used to reduce the public debt of the United States, (2) any gift of obligations of the United States included in the public debt of the United States, if made on the sole condition that the obligations be canceled and retired and not reissued, or (3) any gift of other intangible personal property made on the sole condition that it be sold, and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States; and

"(b) the Administrator of General Services as authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, made to the United States on the sole condition that it be sold and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States: *Provided, however,* that the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services, as the case may be, is authorized to reject any gift under this section whenever he determines such action to be in the interest of the United States." (31 U.S.C. 901.)

Conversion into money

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of subsection (a) (3) of section 901 of this title; and the Administrator of General Services shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of section 901 of this title." (31 U.S.C. 902.)

Gifts for Defense Purposes

Acceptance of gifts by Secretary of the Treasury and Administrator of General Services

"To further the defense effort of the United States—

"(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of money or other intangible personal property made on condition that it be used for a particular defense purpose; and

"(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept or reject on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, made on condition that it be used for a particular defense purpose." (50 U.S.C. 1151.)

(6) POSTAL SERVICE

(see also No. 7 below)

Gifts, donations of services and property

"The Postmaster General may accept gifts and donations of services and property in aid of the activities of the Department." (39 U.S.C. 2101.)

(7) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (SEE ALSO NO. 5 ABOVE)

Acceptance of gifts of real, personal, or other property

"The Administrator of General Service, together with the Postmaster General where his office is concerned, is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States unconditional gifts of real, personal, or other property in aid of any project or function within their respective jurisdictions." (40 U.S.C. 298a.)

Acquisition of buildings and their sites

"The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, any building and its site which he determines to be necessary to carry out his duties under this chapter." (40 U.S.C. 602.)

Alteration of buildings; acquisition of land; exemption from committee approval

"(a) The Administrator is authorized to alter any public building, and to acquire in accordance with section 604 of this title such land as may be necessary to carry out such alteration." (40 U.S.C. 603.)

Sites

Acquisition of lands or interest therein.

"The Administrator is authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, such lands or interests in lands as he deems necessary for use as sites, or additions to sites, for public buildings authorized to be constructed or altered under this chapter." (40 U.S.C. 604.)

(8) SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Acceptance and disposition of gifts

"The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States gifts made unconditionally by will or otherwise for the benefit of the Service or for the carrying out of any of its functions. Conditional gifts may be so accepted if recommended by the Surgeon General, and the principal of and income from any such conditional gift shall be held, invested, reinvested, and used in accordance with its conditions, but no gift shall be accepted which is conditioned upon any expenditure not to be met therefrom or from the income thereof unless such expenditure has been approved by Act of Congress." (42 U.S.C. 219.)

(9) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Functions of the Administration

"The Administration in order to carry out the purpose of this chapter, shall accept unconditional gifts or donations of services, money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible." (42 U.S.C. 2473(a) (4).)

(10) SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Acceptance of gifts and bequests for purposes of the Department; separate fund; disbursements

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department of Commerce. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed upon order of the Secretary of Commerce. Property accepted pursuant to this provision, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift or bequest." (15 U.S.C. 1522.)

(11) SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Authority to accept and hold gifts and bequests for purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department

"The Secretary is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or bequests shall be deposited in the Treasury in a separate fund and shall be disbursed upon order of the Secretary. Property accepted pursuant to this paragraph, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift or bequest." (49 U.S.C. 1657(m).)

Many provisions authorize the acceptance of property for parks,

battlefields, national monuments, etc., all of which, it would seem, may be regarded as precedents for the acceptance of property under H.R. 11832. (See enclosed pages from U.S. Code Index)

HUGH P. PRICE,
Legislative Attorney.

The *second* committee amendment is designed to close a possible loophole in the Criminal Code applicable to smuggling goods into the United States. The bill specifically applies the provisions and penalties of 18 U.S.C. 545 to the bringing of animals to the proposed quarantine station or the subsequent movement of these animals to other parts of the United States.

However, 18 U.S.C. 545 defines the term "United States" as *not* including the Virgin Islands (among other jurisdictions). Neither does this definition specifically include Puerto Rico.

The committee was concerned that if an island near the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico were selected as the site for the quarantine facility the entry of diseased animals into the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico would not be covered by the criminal sanctions of 18 U.S.C. 545. Accordingly, the committee adopted an amendment to specifically include the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico within the definition of the term "United States" and thereby apply the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 545 to these jurisdictions as well.

In addition, this committee amendment deleted from the bill the language which would have permitted the Secretary to issue, under this legislation, regulations, a violation of which would be subject to the criminal sanctions of 18 U.S.C. 545. Specific authority for the Secretary to issue such regulations as he deems necessary is included in section 1 of H.R. 11832.

COST

The Department of Agriculture stated that the estimated cost of constructing the quarantine facility would be \$2.5 million. USDA also pointed out that the annual operating and maintenance expenses would be \$1.3 million, but that these costs would be largely financed by fees collected from importers using the quarantine facilities. The adoption of the committee amendment allowing donation of personal property would of course also permit the reduction of the initial cost of constructing and operating the quarantine facilities.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture submitted the following report recommending enactment of H.R. 11832:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1969.

HON. W. R. POAGE,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of June 18, 1969, requesting a report on H.R. 11832. The bill is entitled "To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent

movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes."

The bill would authorize the Secretary to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States, and permit, under appropriate safeguards, the movement of animals into the United States otherwise prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws. The quarantine station would be located on an island selected by the Secretary on the basis that it would permit the maintenance of maximum animal disease and pest security measures. Under the bill, movements to the quarantine station or to other parts of the United States would be prohibited unless made in accordance with conditions prescribed in regulations of this Department as adequate to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign countries.

This Department recommends enactment of H.R. 11832, if amended as follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the "period" add the following sentence: "The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act."

A more detailed statement in support of this position is attached.

Enactment of the bill would necessitate additional appropriations. The exact location of an island suitable for establishment of the proposed international quarantine station would heavily influence the construction costs. Another influencing factor could be whether or not any costs would be involved for land acquisition. The best approximation, at this time, is that approximately \$2.5 million would be needed on a nonrecurring basis for the construction of the facilities. The total operating and maintenance expenses for the quarantine station would be approximately \$1.3 million annually. It is anticipated that these costs would be financed largely through the collection of fees from importers for the use of the facilities. The fee would include costs for the care, feed, and handling of animals during the period of quarantine as well as other costs incident to the quarantine of animals; e.g., fences, equipment, utilities, supplies and materials to the extent they are not covered by appropriations.

There would be no expenditure of funds for this purpose prior to fiscal year 1971.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL.
Acting Secretary.

USDA POSITION IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 11832

The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1306) contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of all ruminants and swine (except wild zoo animals) and fresh, chilled or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by this Department to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. Under very stringent

restrictions, including authority for permanent postentry quarantine, wild ruminants and swine may be permitted entry under the Act when such animals are solely for exhibition at an approved zoological park from which they cannot be moved except to another approved zoological park.

Provisions in the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111) and the act of July 2, 1962 (21 U.S.C. 134 et seq.) provided additional authority and responsibility for prohibiting or restricting importation of animals, meat, and other articles in order to prevent the introduction or dissemination of foot-and-mouth disease and other destructive livestock or poultry diseases and pests such as African swine fever, exotic ticks, African horse sickness, and fowl pest.

These statutes are implemented by extensive and strict regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 9, parts 92, 94, 95, and 96. These regulations apply to the importation of animals, meats, animal byproducts and materials such as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease exists. The regulations are based on the best scientific information available, including the research being done at our Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, Long Island, N.Y.

Our primary responsibility is and will continue to be the prevention of livestock and poultry diseases and pests gaining entry from foreign countries. At the same time we recognize that there are breeds and types of foreign livestock with the potential of bringing about specific desired improvements more rapidly in U.S. livestock production than can be accomplished with domestic breeds. Research activities have demonstrated the high potential of crossbreeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in livestock production. Crossbreeding can bring about changes in the character and composition of the product more rapidly than any other breeding procedure. It has been further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossbreeding, the greater benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics. For instance, the introduction into the United States of exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal new varieties of high-yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in every-day use on farms and ranches.

The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals are expected to be similar to those experienced in crop production. Some of the improvements in livestock production would include:

(a) *Beef cattle*.—An increase in weaning weight, postweaning growth rates, and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival;

(b) *Dairy cattle*.—An increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival;

(c) *Sheep*.—An increase in lambing rate, lamb growth rate and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat;

(d) *Swine*.—An increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

In spite of the benefits to be derived, the importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries must not be done at the risk of introducing diseases and pests not now present in this country which would greatly reduce livestock production. We believe that both objectives can be obtained only by the establishment of an international animal quarantine station. The establishment and operation of such a station would have to be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture. It would involve selection of an island site where maximum disease security measures could be utilized.



91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11832

[Report No. 91-776]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 3, 1969

Mr. PURCELL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his dis-
4 cretion, to establish and maintain an international animal
5 quarantine station within the territory of the United States.
6 The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected
7 by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, max-
8 imum animal disease and pest security measures can be

1 maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to
2 acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation,
3 exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings,
4 improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for
5 the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine sta-
6 tion. *The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United*
7 *States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money,*
8 *personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facili-*
9 *ties for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized*
10 *under this Act.* Notwithstanding the provisions of any other
11 law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock
12 or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the
13 quarantine station from any country, including but not
14 limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agri-
15 culture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease
16 exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United
17 States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary
18 of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to pre-
19 vent the introduction into and the dissemination within the
20 United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The
21 Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such
22 manner as he deems appropriate, with other North Amer-
23 ican countries or with breeders' organizations or similar
24 organizations or with individuals within the United States
25 regarding importation of animals into and through the quar-

1 quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for
2 use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such
3 fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States
4 to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating
5 expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is author-
6 ized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry
7 out the provisions of this Act.

8 SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of
9 title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of
10 animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent move-
11 ment of animals to other parts of the United States ~~contrary~~
12 ~~to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations~~
13 ~~issued hereunder~~, *including Puerto Rico and the Virgin*
14 *Islands.*

15 SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
16 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of
17 this Act.

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PURCELL

JUNE 3, 1969

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DECEMBER 19, 1969

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Jan. 28, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 9

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,8,12	Feed grains.....20	Personnel.....2,30
Area redevelopment.....28	Food-aid.....3	Pesticides.....29
Asst. Secretary.....18	Food stamps.....31	Population.....17
Budget.....27	Foreign affairs.....18	Property.....22
Buildings.....32	Foreign aid.....8	Quarantine station.....7
Committee employees.....5	Foreign trade.....16	Research.....23,24
Conservation.....10	Forests.....10,19	River basins.....35
Cotton.....21	Grazing fees.....4,15	Taxation.....19
Egg inspection.....6	Grapes.....11	Textiles.....16
Employment.....25	Hunger.....3,36	Timber.....19
Environment.....13,14,23	Inflation.....9,12,27	Transportation.....33
Erosion.....34	Labeling.....26	Veto message.....1,12
Farm labor.....11	Nutrition.....36	Wilderness.....10
Farm program.....21,31	Packaging.....26	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported egg products inspection bill and bill to establish international quarantine station. Rep. Findley urged this Department to withdraw opposition to Texas food-aid court order. Rep. Abernethy introduced and discussed cotton bill. House sustained veto of Labor-HEW appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS; VETO MESSAGE. Sustained, 226 to 191, the President's veto of H. R. 13111, making appropriations for Labor-HEW for fiscal year 1970. pp. H391-458
2. PERSONNEL. The Civil Service subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 13008, amended, the proposed Job Evaluation Policy Act of 1969. p. D36

3. FOOD-AID; HUNGER. Rep. Findley stated this Department "should withdraw its opposition to a court order requiring that Federal food-aid programs for poor families be established immediately in 88 Texas counties." pp. H472-4
Rep. Schwengel praised the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation and the walk for development program. pp. H459-71
4. GRAZING FEES. Rep. Saylor criticized the "grazing fee moratorium decision", stated "It is time the public's ^{voice} was heard" and inserted comments on this subject. pp. H474-8
5. COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES. Received list of committee employees showing salaries for the 6-month period from July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969. pp. H481-90

SENATE

6. EGG INSPECTION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2116, to provide for inspection of certain egg products (S. Rept. 91-639). p. S726
7. QUARANTINE STATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2306, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station (S. Rept. 91-638). p. S726
8. APPROPRIATIONS; FOREIGN AID. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 15149, fiscal 1970 appropriations for the foreign aid program. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S764-770
9. INFLATION. Sen. Hansen criticized economist Gardner Ackley, remarking that Ackley's criticism of the HEW veto was evidence "that the absence of Democratic Party economists from the Government is having a positively beneficial effect." p. S725
10. CONSERVATION; WILDERNESS: FORESTS. Sen. Yarborough inserted a Southwestern Association of Naturalists resolution endorsing the creation of the Big Thicket National Park. p. S735
11. GRAPES; FARM LABOR. Sen. Kennedy inserted an article which records the success of the United Farm Workers organization in securing union benefits for farmworkers in the grape-growing areas. pp. S736-8
12. VETO MESSAGE; APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Hartke criticized the Labor-HEW veto message, arguing that "Congress, by reducing President Nixon's spending requests by \$5.6 billion and by redistributing some of this spending to domestic needs, demonstrated its commitment to reordering our national priorities and to fighting inflation." p. S739
13. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Murphy inserted Interior Asst. Secretary Smith's address which offers the view that "Nature is never static nor is a totally natural environment always the most suitable for civilization. Our Challenge is to maintain the delicate balance between man and nature...and shape our environment in such a manner as to leave a better quality of living to future generations." pp. S752-3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

14. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Church stated that one of the greatest problems which we are currently facing is that of cleaning up our environment. pp. E424-5

INTERNATIONAL ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION

JANUARY 28, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2306]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

This bill provides for the establishment of an international quarantine station, and the movement through it into the United States of animals which might otherwise be excluded by the animal quarantine laws. Such movement could be made only under conditions adequate to prevent the introduction of disease into the United States, and the Department of Agriculture advises that it regards such prevention as its prime responsibility. The bill would make it possible to bring in breeding stock to improve the U.S. livestock industry.

The station would be located on an island within U.S. territory. The Secretary would be authorized to acquire land by purchase, donation, or otherwise, to construct necessary improvements, and to charge user fees.

The committee amendment, which was recommended by the Department of Agriculture, would authorize the Secretary to accept gifts for the purpose of carrying out the act.

The committee's Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation conducted hearings on the bill on December 8, 1969. All witnesses supported the bill.

The report of the Department of Agriculture, which recommends enactment of the bill, estimates that \$2.5 million would be required for

construction of the facilities and \$1.3 million would be required annually for operating and maintenance costs. The latter amount would largely be recovered through user fees from importers.

The prime consideration in operation of the station should be prevention of the entry of livestock and poultry diseases. To this end—

1. The Department should make full use of current knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease, derived from both research and experience, and apply without deviation all necessary requirements to prevent introduction of these diseases into any part of North America.

2. Access to the quarantine facility should be restricted to surface carriers. Shipment of animals by air inevitably creates problems of availability of alternate landing sites, none of which would be equipped to provide the necessary safeguards against disease transmission.

3. No animals should be brought to the quarantine facility until all necessary buildings, equipment, and staff are available.

4. Provision should be made for the immediate destruction and disposal of all susceptible animals exposed to any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest that may occur at the quarantine station.

5. Adequate measures should be provided to protect against the introduction of other important communicable diseases including, but not limited to, tuberculosis, brucellosis, scabies, trichomoniasis, vibriosis, anaplasmosis, and piroplasmosis.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1969.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of June 26, 1969, requesting a report on S. 2306. The bill is entitled "To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes."

The bill would authorize the Secretary to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States, and permit, under appropriate safeguards, the movement of animals into the United States otherwise prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws. The quarantine station would be located on an island selected by the Secretary on the basis that it would permit the maintenance of maximum animal disease and pest security measures. Under the bill, movements to the quarantine station or to other parts of the United States would be prohibited unless made in accordance with conditions prescribed in regulations of this Department as adequate to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign countries.

This Department recommends enactment of S. 2306, if amended as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the "period" add the following sentence:

The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act.

A more detailed statement in support of this position is attached.

Enactment of the bill would necessitate additional appropriations. The exact location of an island suitable for establishment of the proposed international quarantine station would heavily influence the construction costs. Another influencing factor could be whether or not any costs would be involved for land acquisition. The best approximation, at this time, is that approximately \$2.5 million would be needed on a nonrecurring basis for the construction of the facilities. The total operating and maintenance expenses for the quarantine station would be approximately \$1.3 million annually. It is anticipated that these costs would be financed largely through the collection of fees from importers for the use of the facilities. The fee would include costs for the care, feed, and handling of animals during the period of quarantine as well as other costs incident to the quarantine of animals; for example, fences, equipment, utilities, supplies and materials to the extent they are not covered by appropriations.

There would be no expenditure of funds for this purpose prior to fiscal year 1971.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Acting Secretary.

USDA POSITION IN SUPPORT OF S. 2306

The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1306) contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of all ruminants and swine (except wild zoo animals) and fresh, chilled, or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by this Department to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. Under very stringent restrictions, including authority for permanent postentry quarantine, wild ruminants and swine may be permitted entry under the act when such animals are solely for exhibition at an approved zoological park from which they cannot be moved except to another approved zoological park.

Provisions in the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111) and the act of July 2, 1962 (21 U.S.C. 134 et seq.) provide additional authority and responsibility for prohibiting or restricting importation of animals, meat, and other articles in order to prevent the introduction or dissemination of foot-and-mouth disease and other destructive livestock or poultry diseases and pests such as African swine fever, exotic ticks, African horse sickness, and fowl pest.

These statutes are implemented by extensive and strict regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 9, parts 92, 94, 95, and 96. These regulations apply to the importation of animals, meats, animal by-products and materials such as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease exists. The regulations are based on the best scientific information available, including the research being done at our Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory, Long Island, N.Y.

Our primary responsibility is, and will continue to be, the prevention of livestock and poultry diseases and pests gaining entry from foreign countries. At the same time we recognize that there are breeds and types of foreign livestock with the potential of bringing about specific desired improvements more rapidly in U.S. livestock production than can be accomplished with domestic breeds. Research activities have demonstrated the high potential of crossbreeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in livestock production. Crossbreeding can bring about changes in the character and composition of the product more rapidly than any other breeding procedure. It has been further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossbreeding, the greater benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics. For instance, the introduction into the United States of exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal new varieties of high-yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in everyday use on farms and ranches.

The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals are expected to be similar to those experienced in crop production. Some of the improvements in livestock production would include—

(a) *Beef cattle*.—An increase in weaning weight, postweaning growth rates, and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival;

(b) *Dairy cattle*.—An increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival;

(c) *Sheep*.—An increase in lambing rate, lamb growth rate and muscularity, and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and

(d) *Swine*.—An increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

In spite of the benefits to be derived, the importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries must not be done at the risk of introducing diseases and pests not now present in this country which would greatly reduce livestock production. We believe that both objectives can be obtained only by the establishment of an international animal quarantine station. The establishment and operation of such a station would have to be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture. It would involve selection of an island site where maximum disease security measures could be utilized.

Calendar No. 629

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 2306

[Report No. 91-638]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 5, 1969

Mr. HRUSKA introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

JUNE 24, 1969

The Committee on Finance discharged, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JANUARY 28, 1970

Reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, with an amendment

[Insert the part printed in *italic*]

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discre-
4 tion, to establish and maintain an international animal quar-
5 antine station within the territory of the United States. The
6 quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by
7 the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maxi-

1 mum animal disease and pest security measures can be main-
2 tained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire
3 land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange,
4 or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements,
5 and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment
6 and maintenance of such quarantine station. *The Secretary*
7 *of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized*
8 *to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property,*
9 *buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose*
10 *of conducting the functions authorized under this Act.* Not-
11 withstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent
12 the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry
13 disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quar-
14 antine station from any country, including, but not limited
15 to, those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture
16 determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists,
17 and subsequently moved into other parts of the United
18 States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary
19 of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to
20 prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within
21 the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests.
22 The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate
23 in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North
24 American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar
25 organizations or with individuals within the United States

1 regarding importation of animals into and through the
2 quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable
3 fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers.
4 Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United
5 States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the
6 operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary
7 is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary
8 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

9 SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of
10 title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of
11 animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent move-
12 ment of animals to other parts of the United States contrary
13 to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations
14 issued hereunder.

15 SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated
16 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of
17 this Act.

S. 2306

[Report No. 91-638]

A BILL

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HRUSKA

JUNE 5, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance

JUNE 24, 1969

The Committee on Finance discharged, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JANUARY 28, 1970

Reported with an amendment

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Jan. 30, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 11

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7	Farm program.....8	Pollution.....3,5
Conservation.....6	Feed grains.....4	Public lands.....11
Credit.....9	Horses.....11	Quarantine station.....2
Dairy indemnity.....8	Hunger.....10	Recreation.....6
Economics.....9	Livestock.....2	Tomatoes.....1
Environment.....3,5	Marketing orders.....1	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to establish international quarantine station.
Senate passed bill to permit paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes. House committee approved dairy indemnity program as part of general farm legislation.

SENATE

1. TOMATOES. Passed as reported S. 1862, to permit paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes. p. S951
2. LIVESTOCK. Passed as reported S. 2306, to establish an international quarantine station, and to permit entry therein of animals for purposes of improving livestock breeds. pp. S951-4
3. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Griffin commended the Presidential appointments to the Council on Environmental Quality. p. S917
4. FEED GRAINS. Sen. Mondale inserted a corrected table on the feed grains program in Minn. pp. S925-6

5. POLLUTION. Sen. Symington noted that the National Carwash Council has prepared a publication, "Waste Water Treatment Report and Guidelines", to assist owners of car wash installations to do their part in reducing pollution. p. S913
6. CONSERVATION; RECREATION. Sen. Gore suggested the establishment of the Big South Fork, Tenn., National Park, and inserted a list of organizations supporting the proposition. pp. S923-4
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 2. p. S958

HOUSE

8. DAIRY INDEMNITY. The "Daily Digest" states that the Committee on Agriculture met in executive session and approved the dairy indemnity program as part of the general farm legislation. p. D48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

9. CREDIT; ECONOMICS. Rep. Ullman inserted an article, "Worry Over Debt: Some Analysts Fear Credit Volume Poses Threat." pp. E564-5
10. HUNGER. Rep. Dulski commended the Young World Development Conference who march to raise money to feed the hungry around the world. pp. S566-7

BILL INTRODUCED

11. HORSES. S. 3358, by Ben. Hansen, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Food stamp program (markup); extension of Public Law 480; and general farm legislation
H. Agriculture (exec).
Emergency home financing, H. Banking and Currency.
Environmental decade, H. Gov't Operations.
Report on study of Nation's estuaries, H. Merchant Marine.

oOo

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, issues dealing with the antitrust laws are as complex as any that are presented to the Senate. This bill is no exception. It was handled with great skill by the principal sponsor of the legislation, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE). To him and to the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, who had raised significant reservations and objections to the import of this bill, the leadership wishes to express its sincere thanks as well as admiration. The arguments were presented succinctly and forcefully by them and the expeditious manner that has been set on this measure should set a fine example for the remainder of the session.

To them and the distinguished Senators from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FANNIN), the leadership is indebted for assisting in the orderly disposition of the Senate's work.

THE 25TH ROLLCALL VOTE THIS SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if I am correct, the vote on the passage of the bill is the 25th rollcall vote taken this session. I think it is interesting to note that in the first session of this Congress it was not until the 13th of May that the Senate reached its 25th rollcall vote. Therefore, this is indeed progress. It shows the beneficial results of the fact that we are reminded by others, and frequently remind ourselves, of the necessity of expediting the work of the Congress. I am delighted to be able to make this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is delighted to be so notified.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, if I may observe, in view of the statement made by the minority leader, this is the second session of the 91st Congress, and I would think we would be starting to vote earlier this time than we did last year.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, may I now inquire as to the order of business for the remainder of the day and for the immediate future?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four bills will be taken up this afternoon. Three of them are noncontroversial. There will be some discussion on one of them. Then it is intended to lay before the Senate the mass transportation bill as the business on Monday.

I had thought that we would go into Saturday on the pending measure. Fortunately for all of us, this will not be necessary and, therefore, with no business before us, we will not meet tomorrow; it is not the intention of the joint leadership to hold sessions on Saturday just for the purpose of making and appearance here.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

PROJECTS FOR PAID ADVERTISING UNDER MARKETING ORDERS APPLICABLE TO TOMATOES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 628, S. 1862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1862) to amend section 8c(6) (I) on the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act", strike out "of 1933"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 1862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "or avocados" in the proviso, and inserting in lieu thereof "avocados, or tomatoes".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 91-637, explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill is identical to title II of S. 1811, which passed the Senate on October 16, 1969, and again on October 20, 1969. S. 1181 contained rather detailed legislation with respect to potatoes in addition to this simple provision for tomatoes. On November 12, the House rejected H.R. 2777, which was a companion bill to the potato provisions of S. 1181; and there is therefore now no possibility of enactment of S. 1181. There has at no time been any opposition to the provisions of S. 1181 dealing with tomatoes.

This bill amends section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c (6) (I)) to add tomatoes to the list of commodities for which paid advertising can be provided in promotional programs under marketing orders. Promotional programs under marketing orders are already authorized, but paid advertising can be included in them only if specifically authorized. At present paid advertising is authorized for cherries, carrots, citrus fruits, onions, Tokay grapes, fresh pears, dates, plums, nectarines, celery, sweet corn, limes, olives, pecans, and avocados. The bill would add tomatoes to this list.

Before an order can be issued, hearings are held, and all its terms must be approved

by the Secretary of Agriculture and by two-thirds in volume or number of the producers.

The committee amendments are of a purely technical nature. They amend the bill and its title so that they correctly cite the act being amended by the bill.

INTERNATIONAL ANIMAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 629, S. 2306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "station," insert: "The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act.";

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2306

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including, but not limited to, those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such

manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 5, 1969, I introduced S. 2306, entitled "The International Livestock Quarantine Station Act." This bill provided that the Department of Agriculture would have the authority to establish and operate an international animal quarantine station on an island within the territory of the United States, and, in connection with the station, permit the movement of animals into the United States which would otherwise be prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws.

Many livestock producers and organizations have written to me expressing their strong support for S. 2306 and urging prompt action. The interest in this bill has continued to grow, as both consumers and producers have realized the benefits that can accrue.

I am deeply gratified for the action of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee in recommending this bill favorably. The hearings held by Senator JORDAN's Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation were conducted by the chairman with keen interest and very complete examination of the witnesses. Senator JORDAN, and other subcommittee members, displayed their great knowledge of the livestock industry and its needs during those hearings. They covered fully the many aspects of this proposed animal quarantine station, and the hearings were an education for all of us who attended.

Mr. President, our livestock industry is the most efficient and productive in the world. It provides our growing population with an ample supply of wholesome and inexpensive meat and dairy products and provides numerous allied industries with the basic supplies for their ultimate products. Cash receipts from sale of meat animals in 1968 were \$15.4 billion, and cash receipts from dairy products amounted to \$6 billion, a total of over \$21.4 billion. There can be little doubt then that the livestock industry is a major industry, and vital to our economic as well as our physical health.

A great challenge faced by the livestock industry today is increasing its productivity at the necessary rate to keep up with the demand, and to do so on increasingly smaller amounts of land. One answer to this challenge is to improve the quality of the animals so that fewer animals can provide a greater quantity of produce.

Seeking to improve the quality of American animals, the livestock producers have become vitally concerned with "hybrid vigor," which is the description used for new germ plasm for breeding stock.

Hybrid vigor from new blood lines can have many salutary advantages for the stock. It can improve productivity, that is, the ratio of the number of births to the number of head of breeding stock each year. New germ plasm can greatly improve the survival rate, and reduce the loss of young stock.

This crossbreeding can promote more rapid growth of livestock, and enable producers to market them sooner. And finally, crossbreeding can improve the feed conversion rate of the livestock, which means that they can put on weight more quickly with less amounts of feed. For these reasons, American livestock industries are vitally interested in obtaining new bloodlines.

The demand for new bloodlines has directed attention to importing into the United States new and different breeds from foreign countries. Importing new bloodlines is not an easy task, however, because of the threat of foot-and-mouth disease.

Only a few countries are free of foot-and-mouth disease—all of North America and Central America, most of the countries or islands of the Caribbean area, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Republic of Ireland, North Ireland, Channel Islands, and Norway. All other European countries, Soviet Union, South America, and African nations and the Middle and Far Eastern countries are recurring sources of the disease for the rest of the world.

After the United States eradicated the remnants of the disease in 1929, and poignantly aware of the resulting losses, the Congress in 1930 passed a law to regulate strictly importation of products which are potential carriers of foot-and-mouth disease. This legislation was embodied in the Tariff Act of 1930. It prohibits importation of susceptible animals and fresh-chilled or frozen meat from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists. Since its enactment, this disease has been effectively precluded from this country. But, the restrictions under this law, while once wholly effective, do not provide the same protection today, in an era of increasing efforts of other nations to export their livestock to the United States to meet the breeding needs of our livestock industry.

The Canadian Government has created two animal quarantine control centers to receive livestock from countries with foot-and-mouth disease, and has established a strict procedure of maximum quarantine for those animals.

U.S. livestock interests have then been able to purchase livestock from the Ca-

nadians after the animals were declared safe by the Canadian Government. This total procedure, however, has become very costly. It has been estimated to cost at least \$5,000 per head for this quarantine procedure.

The Canadian Government deserves to be commended for its high standards. Requiring very thorough, extensive, and elaborate controls on livestock coming from countries such as France, and then requiring a period of quarantine, the Canadian Government has been able to exclude completely any animal carrying foot-and-mouth disease from ever being released from the center.

The United States has relied upon the Canadians to apply the strictest controls and the Canadians have not breached that trust. This relationship has been, and I am confident would continue to be, satisfactory and wholly responsible. The Canadians, of course, have reason enough to be dissatisfied with this as a permanent arrangement because many of the livestock head are ultimately sold in the United States even though Canada supervises the importation and quarantine. In fact, the Canadians have recently imposed a 3-year embargo on export of livestock which has come into Canada through the quarantine procedure.

Also the United States has reason to be concerned if only for the fact that although many of the livestock head do come to the United States, the United States does not control the apparatus of importation and quarantine. The Department of Agriculture has considered this lack of control as a minimal risk. In order to eliminate any doubts, however, it has ordered American veterinarians to meet any livestock shipments from foreign lands to Canada which would ultimately be bought by U.S. interests. This, the Department concedes, is expensive and a burdensome procedure. These are not the major reasons, though, for seeking United States control of importation and quarantine.

Other countries, such as Japan and Ireland, which are considered free of the disease under the tariff law of 1930, are now also seeking to establish quarantine centers for foreign livestock from afflicted countries for ultimate export to the United States.

The Department of Agriculture cannot continue to send American veterinarians to these notions to accompany those foreign livestock through all of the elaborate quarantine controls. Nor can the Department afford to take the risk of not sending those veterinarians.

The more disease-free countries that seek to do this, the greater the expense to the American Government, and the more difficult it is to supervise the increasingly diverse systems of quarantine control of other countries.

So, a U.S. livestock quarantine station will bring two major benefits to the livestock industry. It will permit more breeding livestock to be brought into the United States in volume considered necessary and it can be brought in more economically. Of equal importance, the U.S. Government will be in control of the facilities and we can assure that the veterinary tests and quarantine facilities will always be of the highest quality.

The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals can be expected to promote more rapid growth of livestock and enable producers to market them sooner. Some of the improvements in livestock production would include beef cattle—an increase in weaning weight, postweaning growth rates and muscularity, a decrease in carcass waste fat, and improved fertility and calf survival; dairy cattle—an increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival; sheep—an increase in lambing rate, lamb growth rate and muscularity and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and swine—an increase in prolificacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

The Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has carefully studied this matter and has determined that an international livestock quarantine station is feasible and desirable.

Among the reasons cited by the ARS to explain why an international livestock quarantine station is needed are the following:

First. Livestock products, particularly beef, are in high demand by consumers.

Second. Consumer desires in meat and milk are changing. There is interest in less fat but high content of other desirable nutrients.

Third. Producers are under stress from high production costs and they need to find ways to reduce costs and to increase efficiency and returns.

Fourth. The nature of production makes it difficult for producers to adjust quickly and to respond to consumer desires by patterning products to meet those consumer desires.

Fifth. Opportunities to adjust production practices, types of animals, and product characteristics are limited and require time.

Sixth. One important course of action is to breed and develop animals which are more productive and which can efficiently produce more desirable products.

Seventh. The genetic base of some classes of livestock now available in the United States is narrow. It is based on only a few of the many breeds of the world. In some cases our present breeds are based on a relatively few animals introduced from northern Europe 60 to 80 years ago.

Eighth. Science has demonstrated high potential of cross-breeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in production. In some cases it can also bring about, more rapidly than any other breeding procedure, changes in the character and composition of the product.

Ninth. Science has further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in crossing the greater the benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics.

Tenth. Exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world introduced in the United States has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal

new varieties of high-yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in every day use on farms and ranches.

Eleventh. Observations and preliminary investigations suggest that potential benefits are probable in livestock, especially the meat-producing species, in the order of magnitude observed with crops through the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals.

Twelfth. The use of certain exotic breeds likely can bring about desirable changes much faster than the same changes could be achieved within present U.S. breeds through long years of selection.

Thirteenth. The United States needs to provide a safe, orderly way to make the world's livestock population available for use in improving its livestock and livestock products.

Mr. President, the report of the Department of Agriculture, which recommended enactment of the bill, estimates that \$2.5 million would be required for construction of the facilities and \$1.3 million would be required annually for operating and maintaining the facility. After the first year, however, it is expected that expenses for operating the quarantine station would be financed largely by the collection of user fees from importers.

These costs are very reasonable when compared to the possible benefits. On the basis of available information, the Agricultural Research Service has estimated that by the year 1980 and thereafter annual benefits to the livestock producers and the public could amount to in excess of \$1 billion.

Mr. President, the Agriculture Committee added a committee amendment to S. 2306 which would authorize the Secretary to accept gifts for the purpose of carrying out the purpose of the act. The Department recommended this amendment, and the committee found it reasonable and proper. I have no objection, either.

Mr. President, in an age when population growth of our Nation and of the world requires a constantly increasing demand on protein sources for healthy people, and when America is so blessed with a livestock industry capable of meeting the needs of our people with the greatest source of high protein meats and dairy products, which are a luxury and unattainable commodity in many lands, we must provide that industry with the necessary new bloodlines to improve its livestock, but, on the other hand, we cannot, and we must not expose this great industry to, and must protect it from all risks of this smallest of virus which could cause the greatest of tragedies.

A quarantine center owned and operated by the United States for all livestock imports from diseased areas of the world would be an ideal solution.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOLE

Mr. President, my home state of Kansas is well known for its production of wheat.

Through recent years Kansas has also become a leader in the cattle industry. Increasing numbers of beef cattle are being bred, fed and processed in Kansas to the point that Kansas State University recently disclosed facts that the cattle and beef industry in Kansas is the number one contributing element in the Kansas economy—nearly \$1.2 billion in 1968.

With the growth of industry in our state, we have become aware of the importance of constantly improving its quality and efficiency. There is a considerable potential for improvement of cattle and other livestock through the introduction of new genetic configurations and blood lines into the strains common to the U.S. Throughout the world varieties of livestock and other domesticated animals exist which possess characteristics of heartiness, fertility and slaughterweights unknown to animals bred in the United States.

Although these foreign strains may hold great potential for the improvement of American livestock, a serious and, therefore, almost insurmountable barrier has existed to their introduction into this country. Because of the grave and justified concern for the control and elimination of animal diseases, especially foot and mouth disease and rinderpest, U.S. laws regulating the importation of breeding animals have effectively barred all imports of breeding stock.

Recognizing both the desirability of improving U.S. stock and the necessity for insuring continued freedom from disease, S. 2306 embodies a highly desirable approach to the importation of foreign breeding stock. By establishing an island quarantine station where animals bound for the United States may be thoroughly examined and observed, this bill will enable our country to take advantage of the breeding advances made in other parts of the world while maintaining the same strict safeguards against disease that have been the hallmark of our national livestock production.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to act favorably in behalf of S. 2306.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-638), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for the establishment of an international quarantine station, and the movement through it into the United States of animals which might otherwise be excluded by the animal quarantine laws. Such movement could be made only under conditions adequate to prevent the introduction of disease into the United States, and the Department of Agriculture advises that it regards such prevention as its prime responsibility. The bill would make it possible to bring in breeding stock to improve the U.S. livestock industry.

The station would be located on an island within U.S. territory. The Secretary would be authorized to acquire land by purchase, donation, or otherwise, to construct necessary improvements, and to charge user fees.

The committee amendment, which was recommended by the Department of Agriculture, would authorize the Secretary to accept gifts for the purpose of carrying out the act.

The committee's Subcommittee on Agricultural Research and General Legislation conducted hearings on the bill on December 8, 1969. All witnesses supported the bill.

The report of the Department of Agriculture, which recommends enactment of the bill, estimates that \$2.5 million would be required for construction of the facilities and \$1.3 million would be required annually for operating and maintenance costs. The latter

amount would largely be recovered through user fees from importers.

The prime consideration in operation of the station should be prevention of the entry of livestock and poultry diseases. To this end—

1. The Department should make full use of current knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease, derived from both research and experience, and apply without deviation all necessary requirements to prevent introduction of these diseases into any part of North America.

2. Access to the quarantine facility should be restricted to surface carriers. Shipment of animals by air inevitably creates problems of availability of alternate landing sites, none of which would be equipped to provide the necessary safeguards against disease transmission.

3. No animals should be brought to the quarantine facility until all necessary buildings, equipment, and staff are available.

4. Provision should be made for the immediate destruction and disposal of all susceptible animals exposed to any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest that may occur at the quarantine station.

5. Adequate measures should be provided to protect against the introduction of other important communicable diseases including, but not limited to, tuberculosis, brucellosis, scabies, trichomoniasis, vibriosis, anaplasmosis, and piroplasmiasis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 131) to welcome to the United States Olympic delegations authorized by the International Olympic Committee, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 30, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 131) to welcome to the United States Olympic delegations authorized by the International Olympic Committee.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 634, S. 3207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3207) relating to the liabilities of Federal National Mortgage Association to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3207

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(a) In accordance with the provisions of section 303(a) of the National Housing Act concerning payment of a prescribed part of the general surplus and reserves of the corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury \$52,386,117.

(b) In accordance with the provisions of section 309(c) of the National Housing Act as it existed prior to September 1, 1968, the Federal National Mortgage Association shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury the remaining income tax equivalent of \$16,479,604, plus interest on \$2,977,442 at the rate of 6 per centum from September 16, 1967, until the date of payment, on \$13,442,424 at the rate of 6 per centum from September 16, 1968, until the date of payment, and on \$59,738 at 6 per centum from November 16, 1968, until the date of payment.

(c) The receipt by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts required to be paid by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall constitute a full and final settlement of all matters affected by such subsections. The United States shall be made a party defendant in any case against any person who is, has been, or may be a director, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal National Mortgage Association because of any action taken pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this section, and any judgment awarded the Federal National Mortgage Association shall be paid in the same manner as a judgment against the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 302(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The partition transaction effected pursuant to the foregoing paragraph constitutes a reorganization within the meaning of section 368(a)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and for the purposes of such Code, no gain or loss is recognized by the previously existing body corporate by reason of the partition, and the basis and holding period of the assets of the corporation immediately following such partition are the same as the basis and holding period of such assets immediately prior to such partition."

SEC. 3. Section 810(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "For the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, no gain or loss is recognized by the holders of such stock on such change, and the basis and holding period of such stock in the hands of the stockholders immediately after such change are the same as the basis and holding period of such stock in their hands immediately prior to such change."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91-644), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of this bill is to clarify the payment of certain accounts owed by the Federal National Mortgage Association to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with the reorganization of the FNMA.

BACKGROUND OF BILL

The preferred stock of Federal National Mortgage Association, all of which was held

by the Secretary of the Treasury was retired on September 30, 1968. At that time FNMA was required by section 303(a) to "pay to the Secretary of the Treasury for covering into miscellaneous receipts an amount equal to that part of the general surplus and reserves of the corporation (other than reserves established to provide for any depreciation in value of its assets, including mortgages) which shall be deemed to have been earned through the use of the capital represented by the shares held by the Secretary from time to time." That part of the general surplus and reserves of the Corporation deemed to have been earned through the use of preferred stock and carried on the books of the Corporation as representing the earnings attributable to the portion of the capital supplied by the United States, approximated \$52 million. At the time payment of this amount was due to be paid to the United States, FNMA asserted a claim against it based upon a contention by its counsel that it should establish a reserve for depreciation in the value of its mortgages which would wipe out its entire surplus and leave nothing to be paid to the United States. Pending resolution of the issue the \$52 million was placed in a special status account in the Treasury, subject to withdrawal upon the joint order of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Corporation.

Subsequently, on December 12, 1968, after the preferred stock had been retired and after FNMA ceased to be a Government corporation, its Board of Directors attempted retroactively to transfer all its surplus to an account called surplus reserves. The resolution stated that instead of the Board endeavoring to resolve legal questions or ambiguities, it would be more appropriate that such legal questions or ambiguities be resolved either by clarification from the Congress or by authoritative interpretation from the courts.

Shortly before its becoming a private corporation, FNMA had changed its accounting procedures in such a way as to reduce its surplus and the tax equivalent payments made to the Treasury by approximately \$16 million. This change in accounting procedures was disallowed by the Treasury Department so that the total indebtedness of FNMA to the Treasury now exceeds \$68 million.

After several consultations between Counsel for the Treasury and Counsel for the Corporation, it was concluded by the Treasury that there is no alternative but to bring suit against the Corporation to recover the amounts due. Before suit could be brought, however, the President of the Corporation indicated a willingness on the part of the Corporation to pay the full amount due but, because of an alleged concern over possible potential liabilities of officers and directors of the Corporation, the President of the Corporation requested that Treasury Department sponsor legislation. The Treasury Department agreed to this approach but made clear that if legislation is not enacted it sees no alternative but to pursue the matter in the courts.

DISCRIMINATORY STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE CARRIERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 623, S. 2289.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2289) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of Mar. 3, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 31

CONTENTS

Airports.....12	Expenditures.....15	Public Law 480.....9
Appropriations.....2,10	Farmer bargaining.....3	Recreation.....19
Boxcar shortage.....14	Loans.....21	Rural Development.....3
Budget outlays.....22	Newsletter.....17	Special milk.....4
Cigarette labeling.....11	Personnel.....15	Urban-Rural affairs.....13
Cooperatives.....3	Pollution.....18	Water.....23
Economy.....7	Population growth.....1	Wheat.....14
Education.....8,24	Price supports.....5	Wilderness.....20
Environment.....6	Property.....16	

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Young, N.Dak., urged school milk program extension. Sen. Pearson inserted his statement on cooperatives and their role in rural development. Sen. Bayh favored payment limitations and inserted Schnittker testimony. Rep. Mize inserted FHA letter pointing out alleged disparity between urban and rural renewal programs. Rep. Kleppe suggested CCC callup of resale wheat aggravates boxcar shortage.

SENATE

1. POPULATION GROWTH. Agreed to House amendment to S2701, to establish a Commission on Population Growth & the American Future. The bill now goes to the President. pp. S2791-97
2. APPROPRIATION. Passed without amendment S3427 to authorize appropriations for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin. p. S2894
3. COOPERATIVES, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FARMER BARGAINING. Sen. Pearson inserted his statement in which he advocates organized farmer bargaining, and urges an active Co-Op role in the rural development movement. pp. S2841-43
4. SPECIAL MILK. Sen. Young urged passage of the special milk program stating that he shared "the concern over the need to practice governmental economy wherever possible, but I do not feel that this is the place to do it." p. S2830

5. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Bayh commended and inserted the testimony of former Under Secty Schnittker, and stated that he proposes to introduce legislation to place a \$10,000 per commodity limit on price support payments. pp. S2847-48
6. ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Scott cited the need for cooperation of citizens, all levels of government, and business, to achieve environmental quality. pp. S2832-33
7. ECONOMY. Sen. Javits inserted his speech "Combating Inflation and Recession: The Economic Battleground In A Political War", in which he expresses his concern over the "lag effect" on the economy when the tight money policy accedes to the easing of money restrictions. pp. S2843-45

HOUSE

8. EDUCATION. Both Houses received the President's message on education which includes the proposed creation of a National Institute of Education within HEW (H. Doc. 91-267); to S. Labor and Public Welfare Committee and H. Education and Labor Committee. pp. S2797-2801, H1405-9

Rep. Ford concurred in the President's recommendations. pp. H1409-10

Received from HEW draft of proposed legislation to establish a National Institute of Education; to Education and Labor Committee. p. H1476

9. PUBLIC LAW 480; WINE; QUARANTINE. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for the consideration of H. R. 14169, ~~to remove certain restrictions against domestic wine under title I of Public Law 480;~~ and H. R. 11832, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station. p. H1477
10. APPROPRIATIONS. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 15931, Labor-HEW appropriations bill for 1970. pp. H1414-9
House received and agreed to conference report on H. R. 15931 (H. Rept. 91-863). pp. H1433-5
11. CIGARETTE LABELING. Conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 6543, to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking. p. D176
12. AIRPORTS; USER CHARGES. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 14465, to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system. p. H1405
13. URBAN-RURAL AFFAIRS. Rep. Mize inserted portions of a letter from the director of the Kansas Farmers Home Administration and stated that it points out "some of the disparity which presently exists between urban renewal programs, and rural renewal programs." pp. H1437-8
14. BOXCAR SHORTAGE. Rep. Kleppe inserted his telegram to this Department asking for a delay in the CCC callup of reseat wheat which would "aggravate" the boxcar shortage. p. H1438

to the Committee on Education and Labor.
1712. A letter from the Secretary of the State, transmitting the ninth annual report on the activities of the East-West Center relative to cultural and technical interchange for the year ending June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86-472; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1713. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 32d semiannual report of the Agency for the period January 1-June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1714. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for the Army to save on the cost of temporary lodging for student officers at Fort Rucker, Ala., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1715. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1716. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of January 31, 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1717. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d) (6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1720. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1721. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a prospectus proposing construction of a post office and courthouse at Aberdeen, Miss., pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 480), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

1722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the first annual report on the examination of financial statements of the Disabled American Veterans national headquarters for the year ended December 31, 1968, and the life membership fund and service foundation for the year ended June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 17, 1932,

as amended by Public Law 90-208; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1723. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the Chief of Engineers on civil works activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

1724. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Assessment of space communications technology (Rept. No. 91-859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 860. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 14169, a bill to amend section 402 of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in order to remove certain restrictions against domestic wine under title I of such act (Rept. No. 91-860). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 861. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11832, a bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-861). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 862. Resolution for consideration of S. 2910, an act to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building (Rept. No. 91-862). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 15931 (Rept. No. 91-863). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16234. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AYRES (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. ERLNBORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 16235. A bill to establish a National Institute of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 16236. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 16237. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16238. A bill to authorize the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations respect-

ing the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, to extend the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16239. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to extend its duration, provide for national standards of ambient air quality, expedite enforcement of air pollution control standards, authorize regulation of fuels and fuel additives, provide for improved controls over motor vehicle emissions, establish standards applicable to dangerous emissions from stationary sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16240. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16241. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16242. A bill to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 16243. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to provide financial assistance for the construction of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16244. A bill to extend the District of Columbia Compulsory Immunization Statute; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 16245. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common and contract carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 16246. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, relating to law enforcement assistance, to encourage the States and units of local government to provide civil service coverage for all law enforcement personnel other than elected officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 16247. A bill to establish nondiscriminatory school systems and to preserve the rights of elementary and secondary students to attend their neighborhood schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16248. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percent across-the-board increase in annuities and pension thereunder (with a minimum retirement annuity of \$80 a month); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 16249. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the right of entry for mining purposes with respect to certain real property located in Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 16250. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 16251. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and an undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common and contract carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 16252. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for investments in certain economically lagging regions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16253. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on School Finance to conduct a comprehensive study of the problems of financing elementary and secondary education in America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 16254. A bill to reduce mortgage interest rates charged middle-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 16255. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payments for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16256. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to ban polyphosphates in detergents and to establish standards and programs to abate and control water pollution by synthetic detergents; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 16257. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 16258. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ROE, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 16259. A bill to provide for the elimination of the use of lead in motor vehicle fuel and the installation of adequate anti-pollution devices on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 16260. A bill to provide that the interest on certain insured loans sold out of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund shall be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 16261. A bill to provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRADEMAs (for himself, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 16262. A bill to establish a National Institute of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 16263. A bill to prohibit diversion of highway revenue; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 16264. A bill to reduce budget outlays by restructuring or terminating certain outmoded or uneconomic Federal programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KETTE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. BROWN of Michigan):

H.R. 16265. A bill to provide a consolidated, comprehensive child development program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 16266. A bill to prohibit creditors from reporting disputed accounts to credit bureaus as delinquent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16267. A bill to provide that the willful and persistent refusal of a creditor to make corrections in the account of a consumer shall relieve the consumer of liability thereon; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 16268. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 16269. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DUJAN (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MANN, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. LUKENS, and Mr. BURKE of Florida):

H.R. 16270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make Indian hospital facilities available to non-Indians under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 16271. A bill to reorganize the executive branch of the Government by transferring to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior certain functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 16272. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16273. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 16274. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the freedom of choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZION:

H.J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth week of April of each year as "National Coin Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens of the United States who are 18 years of age or older and are members of the Armed Forces of the United States shall not be prevented from voting in certain election on grounds of their age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.J. Res. 1112. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of House Report 91-610, 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 863. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to abolish joint sponsorship of bills, memorials or resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. Res. 864. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to abolish joint sponsorship of bills, memorials or resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Serafia R. Impang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 16276. A bill for the relief of William E. Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 16277. A bill for the relief of John R. Hammond and the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

409. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the council of the city of Burbank, Calif., relative to repealing the Emergency Detention Act of 1950; to the Committee on Internal Security.

410. Also, petition of the city council of Boston, Mass., relative to an increase in social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of March 4, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 32

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....14,34	Farm labor.....13	Oyster industry.....14
Alaska claims.....17	Farm program.....11	Personnel.....15
Animal quarantine.....1	Flood control.....24	Pollution.....20
Appropriations.....9	Food protection.....13	Research.....29
Budget.....16	Foreign affairs.....32	Rural development.....12
Clean air.....23	Foreign aid.....3	Safety.....36
Conference.....28	Forests.....6	Scenic rivers.....6
Consumers.....27	Great Plains.....19	Subsidies.....5
Disaster relief.....35	Indian tribes.....2	Sugar.....5
Electrification.....18	Information.....29	Voting record.....22
Environment.....14,34	Insect control.....25	Water resources.....26
Estuaries.....33	Land-grant colleges.....10	Watersheds.....7,31
Expenditures.....8	Libraries.....4	Wildlife.....30
Family planning.....12	Loans.....2	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to establish international quarantine station. Senate committee voted to report bill to provide land-grant status to Virgin Islands and Guam Universities. House committee reported bill to provide loans to Indian tribes. Sen. Harris supported "coalition" farm bill. Sen. Mansfield inserted his statement on rural-urban "imbalance."

HOUSE

1. ANIMAL QUARANTINE. Passed with amendment S. 2306, to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station, after substituting the language of H. R. 11832 which had previously been passed by the House. H. R. 11832 was indefinitely postponed due to passage of S. 2306. pp. H1480-6
2. LOANS; INDIAN TRIBES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 227, to provide for loans to Indian tribes and tribal corporations (H. Rept. No. 91-864). p. H1529

3. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the annual report on the foreign assistance program for the fiscal year 1969 (H. Doc. 91-248); to S. Foreign Relations and H. Foreign Affairs Committees. pp. H1518, S3015
 4. LIBRARIES. Both Houses received from HEW proposed legislation to extend, consolidate, and improve programs under the Library Services and Construction Act; to S. Labor and Public Welfare and H. Education and Labor Committees. pp. H1528, S2941
 5. SUBSIDIES; SUGAR. Both Houses received from GAO a report on procedures to be improved for determining what constitutes a farm, for purposes of subsidy payments under the U. S. sugar program, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; to Gov't Operations Committees. pp. H1529, S2940
 6. FORESTS; SCENIC RIVERS. Received from this Department a copy of the river plan for the Middle Fork River, Calif., pursuant to the provisions of subsection 3(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (82 Stat. 906-918); to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. H1529
 7. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement involving more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to Public Works Committee. p. H1529
 8. EXPENDITURES; WELFARE. Rep. Ashbrook suggested that at the same time the President is recommending enactment of a Federal Economy Act "he is urging us to open up the floodgates to a torrential deluge which will inundate the already sinking taxpayer" in order to provide a welfare reform program. pp. H1521-8
- SENATE
9. APPROPRIATIONS. Adopted the conference report on H. R. 15931, HEW-Labor Appropriations, by unanimous vote. The bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S2913-31, S2935-2938
 10. LAND-GRANT COLLEGES. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry voted to report with amendments (but did not actually report), S. 1148, to provide land-grant status for the College of the Virgin Islands and the University of Guam. p. D180
 11. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Harris reiterated his support for the "Coalition Farm Bill", stating that the administration "consensus" farm bill had no support from the major farm organizations. He listed nine administration actions which "tend to lower farm prices" and have "caused concern" to farmers. pp. S2978-79
 12. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Mansfield expressed his support for S. 15, the proposed rural job development bill, and S. 2108, to encourage family planning on a voluntary basis, remarking that both would help to alleviate the rural/urban imbalance. pp. S2909-10



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1970

No. 32

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Why art thou cast down, O my soul?
and why art thou disquieted within me?
Hope thou in God.*—Psalm 42: 5.

O Thou whose presence underlies all that we do, whose power overarches all that we say, and whose peace surrounds all that we think, we bow at the shrine our fathers founded and lift our spirits unto Thee in prayer. As we offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts, may the fruits of Thy spirit—love and joy, gentleness and goodness, patience and peace—come to new life within us.

We pray for our country and for our people in every section of our land. May the hungry be fed, the ignorant receive knowledge, the fearful find faith, and the weary come to rest at eventide. Grant that we may do all we can that children be raised to walk in right and good paths, that youth discover high ideals for clean and creative living, and that adults in body become adults in mind.

Abundantly bless our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and direct them in all Thy ways—to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2701. An act to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3427. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1970

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 19, 1970.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1970: Hon. FRANK M. CLARK of Pennsylvania, Hon. ALTON LENNON of North Carolina, Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTURE OF BRIDGE AT REMAGEN

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the 7th of March marks the 25th anniversary of one of the most courageous and significant events in World War II; namely, the surprise capture of a bridge over the Rhine River at a town named Remagen.

On that 25th anniversary the 11 living winners of the Distinguished Service Cross are being brought together here in Washington to honor this great chapter in the annals of American military history.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have also asked about the possibility of seeing a certain film which deals with this subject. I am pleased to announce that on Friday, March 6, at 3 p.m., I would like to extend an invitation to my colleagues and members of their staff to come to the new Senate Office Building auditorium—that is, at 3 p.m., on Friday, March 6—to see the film called, "The Bridge at Remagen."

Mr. Speaker, I will ask that at the close of all business and other special orders heretofore granted that tomorrow I may address the House for 1 hour to call particular attention to the heroism of those 11 infantrymen, tankers, and engineers who participated in the capture of the bridge at Remagen, thereby shortening the war in Europe and saving thousands of American lives.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 37 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 37 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DICKINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DICKINSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in his message on education reform, the President noted that he was creating by Executive order a Commission on School Finance to advise him on the revenue needs of this Nation's schools. I should like to say that

I welcome this initiative on the President's part. During the past two decades we increased the number of pupils in our schools by 80 percent. During this same period many local school boards anxiously wondered where the funds were going to come from to provide the necessary education for these children. The Congress recognized this problem when, in 1965, it passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Our situation today, however, is changing. If we look at a graph of the expected growth in our schools during the coming decade, we find that the line begins to flatten out. This is merely a reflection of the fact that the birth rate in this country has been declining for the past 10 years. We must not think, however, that we can cut back on our efforts to educate our children to the best of our ability; rather, we should view this respite from the "numbers game" as a golden opportunity to look at what we have done, to keep the best, and to replace the rest with more promising alternatives.

I think the President stated the problem well in his message when he said:

We must stop congratulating ourselves for spending nearly as much money on education as does the entire rest of the world . . . when we are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend.

I have joined in sponsoring a bill which would set up a means of evaluating quality of education. I also believe the President's revenue sharing measure could be the real answer.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS TODAY SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time

today for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Oklahoma assure the Members that this recess would be for the sole purpose of considering certain legislation, and would the gentleman designate the legislation?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course the gentleman knows that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is meeting, and we do not know whether they will report back to the House today. The gentleman also knows that because of the funeral today any protracted handling of business today by rollcalls or other dilatory methods would not be very apt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman says, but I would like the gentleman to give us some assurances that the recess would be for the purpose of awaiting specific legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, it would be for the purpose of waiting to see whether the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might report certain legislation to the House today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING AN INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 861 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 861

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of bill (H.R. 11832) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the provisions following the period on line 2 to the period on line 5 of page 3 of the bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the

passage of H.R. 11832, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2306 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11832 as passed by the House.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 861 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11832 to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds. The rule also provides that all points of order be waived against lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 3 of the bill, and that, after passage of the House bill, it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of S. 2306 and amend it with the House-passed language.

The waiver of points of order was granted because the specified language on page 3 of the bill mandates the depositing of fees collected from importers in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged against the operating expenses of the quarantine station in violation of clause 4 of House rule XXI.

The purpose of H.R. 11832 is to provide authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate an international quarantine station on an island near the continental United States, most likely off the southeast coast of the United States in the Caribbean area.

This would permit the movement into the United States of animals which are otherwise prohibited or restricted because of general animal quarantine laws. The Secretary would establish terms and conditions to prevent the introduction or spread of livestock or poultry diseases and pests from foreign nations.

The Secretary would be authorized to acquire the necessary real property by purchase, donation, or exchange and to obtain needed personal property, buildings, improvements, or other facilities by private donations, as well as to charge and collect reasonable fees for the use of the station by importers. In addition, the bill authorizes the annual appropriation of such public funds that may be needed.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated the cost of constructing the facility to be \$2.5 million. It is anticipated that the annual operating and maintenance expenses would be \$1.3 million, but that these costs would be largely financed by fees collected from importers using the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 861 in order that H.R. 11832 may be considered.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given per-

mission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and operate an international quarantine station on an island near the continental United States.

Such a station would permit the movement into the United States of animals which are otherwise prohibited or restricted because of general animal quarantine laws.

It is anticipated that the station will be rebuilt on an island in the Caribbean. The bill authorizes the Secretary to acquire the necessary real property by purchase, donation, or exchange, and to construct the needed facilities. Reasonable user fees will be charged importers using the facilities. The bill also authorizes annual appropriations.

The American livestock industry believes that foreign stock, if permitted to enter the country, could improve existing breeds. The Department of Agriculture agrees and supports the bill.

The estimated cost of construction of the facilities is \$2,500,000 and the annual operating expenses are estimated at \$1,300,000. Most of the annual cost would be borne by user fees.

There are no minority views.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio—do I understand correctly that the points of order waived in the rule are to certain language in the bill in order that the revenue derived through this bill will be used to fund this particular enterprise?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, the reason for waiving points of order is found on page 3 of the bill, to wit:

Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station.

Mr. GROSS. And to be credited to the appropriation?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11832) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the

United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11832, with Mr. MATSUNAGA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL).

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself whatever time I may consume.

(Mr. PURCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is a source of personal satisfaction to me. It meets an intense need that has existed for some time, and meets it at little cost to the Federal Government.

The bill provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to establish and operate an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States, and permits the movement of animals into the United States otherwise prohibited or restricted under the animal quarantine laws. The quarantine station would be located on an island, selected so that the location would permit the maintenance of maximum animal disease and pest security measures. Under the bill, movements to other parts of the United States would be prohibited unless made in accordance with conditions determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be adequate to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease and pest from foreign countries.

To understand why this is a significant step forward for the country, Mr. Chairman, we have to look at the current status of the law affecting importation of animals:

Due to an intense fear of animal diseases, the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended—19 U.S.C. 1306—contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of all ruminants and swine—except wild zoo animals, and also against importation of fresh, chilled, or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by the Department of Agriculture to be infected with foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest. Under very stringent restrictions, including authority for permanent postentry quarantine, wild ruminants and swine may be permitted entry under the act when such animals are solely for exhibition at an approved zoological park from which they cannot be moved except to another approved zoological park.

Provision in the act of February 2, 1903, as amended—12 U.S.C. 111—and the act

of July 2, 1962—21 U.S.C. 134—and following—now provide additional authority and responsibility for prohibiting or restricting importation of animals, meat and other articles in order to prevent the introduction or dissemination of foot-and-mouth disease and other destructive livestock or poultry disease and pest such as African swine fever, exotic ticks, African horse sickness, and fowl pest.

These statutes are implemented by extensive and strict regulation in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 9, parts 92, 94, 95, and 96. The regulations apply to the importation of animals, meats, animal by-products, and materials such as hay, straw, and forage from all countries, especially those where foot-and-mouth disease exists. The regulations are based on the best scientific information available, including the Plum Island Disease Laboratory, Long Island, N.Y.

The sum total of the acts cited, and the regulations written under them, is to bar importation of new strains of breed livestock into the United States. While our primary responsibility is, and must continue to be, the prevention of livestock and poultry disease and pests gaining entry from foreign countries, at the same time it has long been apparent that these are breeds and types of foreign livestock with the potential of bringing about specific desired improvements more rapidly in U.S. livestock production than can be accomplished with domestic breeds. Research activities have demonstrated the high potential of cross-breeding to increase reproduction, vigor, growth, and efficiency in livestock production. Cross-breeding can bring about changes in the character and composition of the product more rapidly than any other breeding procedure.

It has been further shown that the wider the genetic diversity of the parent stock used in cross-breeding, the greater are the benefits from hybrid vigor and the greater the possibility for changing production and product characteristics. For instance, the introduction into the United States of exotic germ plasm of plants from all over the world has been a most important factor in bringing about the phenomenal new varieties of high-yielding crops of numerous kinds that are in everyday use on farms and ranches. The potential benefits in our livestock production, especially of meat-producing animals, from the importation and organized use of exotic breeds of animals are expected to be similar to those experienced in crop production. Some of the improvements that are expected include:

First, beef cattle—an increase in weaning weight, in postweaning growth rates, and in muscularity; a decrease in carcass waste fat; and improved fertility and calf survival.

Second, dairy cattle—an increase in milk production, fertility, and calf survival.

Third, sheep—an increase in lambing rate, in lamb growth, and in muscularity; and a decrease in carcass waste fat; and,

Fourth, swine—an increase in prolific-

icacy and muscularity, and improved efficiency of gain.

In spite of the benefits to be derived, the importation of new and different animal breeds from foreign countries must not be done at the risk of introducing disease and pests not now present in this country which would actually greatly reduce livestock production.

Mr. Chairman, both objectives can be obtained only through the establishment of an international quarantine station—a goal which the bill before us today accomplishes—and, as I indicated earlier, it does so at what is little cost to the Federal Government. The language of the bill authorizes the acceptance of gifts or donations or property to build the station, and the fee schedule for use at the station is designed to require as little as possible from annual appropriations to meet this need.

This is a bargain for the American people who, through the new blood strains that can be introduced to our domestic herds, will reap the benefits that increased, less expensive productivity can bring—better and cheaper meat, and increased productivity of dairy products. These benefits also aid the farmer and livestock producer.

The Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains held hearings on the proposed bills, and adopted two amendments to the legislation; it was reported to the full Committee on Agriculture which, without a single dissenting vote, recommended its passage. It is truly a bipartisan effort, Mr. Chairman. It is supported across the country by livestock breeders, and has the blessing of the Department of Agriculture. I am pleased to be here speaking in the bill's behalf, and I heartily recommend its passage.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on the hard work they have done on this bill, and I wish to thank him and his committee on behalf of my own calf and hog raisers for bringing this bill to the floor of the House. I have received numerous telegrams asking me to support this bill. I do so, and I wish to take this moment to congratulate all members of the gentleman's committee for the hard work they have done on the bill.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it the purpose to buy or how is the property to be acquired, the island that the report speaks of, and where?

Mr. PURCELL. The presumption is that an island the United States now owns will be used. We have spoken generally of an island in the Caribbean area. It would have to meet certain scientific criteria.

For example, the scientists have told us it would have to be not closer than 30 miles from shore.

We have made no effort to try to arbitrarily designate an area. We may not own every foot of the land we are talking about, but it would be a U.S. possession. It would be our hope that it is land the Government already owns and therefore not represent an added cost.

Mr. GROSS. But it is not proposed to go out and purchase an island from some other country?

Mr. PURCELL. That is not the proposal.

Mr. GROSS. I seem to get the impression that this might be made quite a research station, and going beyond security against the spread of disease. Would this be in addition to all the research that is now being carried on in behalf of agriculture, or would some of the research now being carried on be transferred to this station?

Mr. PURCELL. I would be glad to discuss any specific language, but it is not our intention that there be any duplication of research in any way. This would be primarily a station where these very rigid rules respecting importation of livestock are maintained. I suppose there would be research to the extent of learning how better to protect ourselves from the diseases. But I think it is safe to say that there would not be any great research going on here; and certainly it is not our intention to duplicate the research that is already being done or is being carried on in some other area.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman just read four or five points that to be found in the report on page 2, which indicate there may be quite a little research carried on—not necessarily with respect to diseases.

Mr. PURCELL. The preamble says:

Some of the anticipated improvements in livestock production include the following:

And then it lists these four items. There may be research carried out with the animals we bring in, but this would be just a way of getting safe animals in order to eventually obtain a better production of beef or swine or mutton, or whatever it might be. There has not been one sentence dropped about establishing this as a research station.

I understand how the gentleman might draw this conclusion, but the intent here is to try to show some of the kinds of opportunities the four listed items would cover.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes the construction of a maximum security import animal quarantine station which would be established on an island somewhere off the coast of the United States, this would make it possible to import under proper conditions of security against foreign diseases breeding ani-

mals which are very much needed by the American livestock industry. The testimony before our subcommittee very strongly established that the genetic quality of our own domestic livestock can be greatly improved by the organized use of certain foreign breeds. At present, in order to bring any of these foreign breeding cattle into this country, our American cattlemen have to use facilities of the Government of Canada; a Canadian quarantine station which is on an island located in the St. Lawrence River, approximately 30 miles downstream from Quebec City, and the prices which our people have to pay to Canadians for cattle which have gone through that station are really extremely high.

One of the cattle breeders testifying in support of this bill told us something about the cost of a Simmental bull, which is one of the breeds all the experts agree are needed in this country for crossbreeding purposes. He was offered a Simmental bull calf by a Canadian breeder for the price of \$100,000, just for a Simmental calf. In addition, the Canadian wanted \$30,000 for semen rights, making a total of \$130,000. The cost of semen is also much, much higher than that for our American breeds.

One of the breeds needed to be introduced here for crossbreeding is the Limousin French breed. There are only six Limousin bulls on the entire North American Continent at present, and they are all in Canada. The Canadians sell the semen from imported Limousin bulls to our American cattlemen at prices from \$6 to \$100 per 1 cc ampoule of semen. This is much higher than domestic semen, which costs \$2.50 to \$4 per ampoule.

This bill is going to be of great benefit to American consumers and the American cattle industry by eliminating these high costs.

The location of the proposed station has not been definitely decided. It will be somewhere on an island off the coast, probably in the Caribbean.

The bill is backed not only by the Department but also by the American Veterinary Association, the U.S. Animal Health Association and the North American Limousin Foundation.

I urge the passage of the bill.

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. I will be glad to yield time to the gentleman from Minnesota, if he wishes.

Mr. ZWACH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAYNE. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH), a member of the committee, for a question.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and of the gentleman from Texas. This is a most important bill, and I give it my full support.

The per capita consumption of red meat in the United States has grown

steadily during the past several years and is continuing. It is thus ironic that the United States is dependent upon our good neighbor to the north for controlling animals which our cattlemen seek to introduce into this vital mainstream of our agricultural economy. The investment required for a quarantine station is minimal when compared to the benefits to be derived.

Animal science, Mr. Chairman, should be a two-way street. We have exported our livestock and our agricultural technology all over the world. It is time now for us to benefit from some of the superior strains and improved breeds of livestock that originate in other parts of the world. This quarantine station will permit this.

As a member of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee, I listened to all the testimony presented on this bill. There was no opposition. There was, of course, concern that the legislation fully protect the public and maintain the high standard of animal health that our domestic livestock industry enjoys.

I believe the bill will do just that, and I urge your support.

(Mr. ZWACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAYNE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I believe I can understand the biological necessity for this quarantine station under the control of the Department of Agriculture, as well as the economic necessity which the gentleman from Iowa has explained.

As a point of information, is it planned to have an insemination laboratory on this island under the quarantine circumstances so that rinderpest, or hoof and mouth disease cannot be tracked in by the inseminating animal, or are we going to have a breeding laboratory on this setup, or are we simply going to hold the animals in quarantine until the danger of infection and infestation has passed and then let them make ingress into the continental United States?

Mr. MAYNE. It is my understanding that the latter is primarily the function of this station, but it does take a considerable period of time to elapse under very strict supervision and observation before it would be safe to admit such animals into the United States.

Mr. HALL. In the opinion of the gentleman from Iowa, then, it would be a holding facility pending the expiration of the requisite quarantine time, after which the animal would then safely be brought in without danger of spreading any infection or infestation, and there would be no artificial insemination laboratories on the island, nor would there be extensive research facilities, and certainly it would not be a breeding lot, so to speak?

Mr. MAYNE. That is the understanding of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. My colleague from Ohio (Mr. MILLER), a member of the committee, has already asked for recognition, and I will yield to him first and then to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Is it true that we are dependent upon Canada because they now have an animal quarantine station?

Mr. MAYNE. Yes. That station is in operation, as I said, in the St. Lawrence River about 30 miles from the city of Quebec. Semen from these imported cattle and any live animals that can be purchased by Americans have to have gone through that station, and the American cattleman is then charged what I consider to be an exorbitant sum in order to get these breeds in through the Canadian middlemen.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. Before I yield I would like to pay tribute to the very fine leadership which the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL), has given throughout the progress of this legislation.

I am now happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to state here on this bill so many other matters that the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains have worked wholly with a cooperative attitude. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE), and all the other members of the subcommittee for their cooperation.

In order more fully to answer the questions asked by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that even prior to these animals being brought to our quarantine station they have come only from very closely supervised areas and have met very stringent requirements as to their not having been inoculated for foot-and-mouth disease and they have been observed all their lives and they are as far removed from these dread diseases as it is biologically possible to have them. Then we bring them on to our quarantine station to try to reduce the cost to our breeders, as the gentleman has so accurately stated with regard to the problem which now exists in Canada. The entire purpose of this is to establish under very close supervision and stringent rules a more economical and more practical system and one whereby the U.S. Government controls the availability of these animals that meet these criteria rather than to have to depend on Canada. Is that not generally the situation that we are dealing with?

Mr. MAYNE. The gentleman from Texas is entirely correct. We satisfied ourselves in the subcommittee in the questioning not only of experts from the Department but those who are in the cattle breeding business that this would clearly be so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Iowa concur with the gentleman from Texas in that this is not designed to become a full-blown research station over a period of time, with expanded research in the Department of Agriculture and, if it is to be expanded into a full-blown research station, it shall be staffed by those already in the Department who are conducting similar research? May we have some assurance that we are not now stepping into vastly expanded research programs?

Mr. MAYNE. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa and I would invite the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain, who is the manager of the bill today, to join me in assuring the gentleman from Iowa that as far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned our intention was to create this animal quarantine station for that limited purpose only.

And, of course, such research as could be more appropriately conducted right on the premises in the presence of these cattle being studied for entrance would be contemplated. However, the bill as I understand it—and I believe that is the understanding by the members of the committee—

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. MAYNE. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I would just restate that today is the very first time to my knowledge that there have been questions in the way of research. It is not our intent to have this in any way and insofar as I am concerned and I think insofar as the committee and this Congress is concerned, the Department of Agriculture would be violating the intent of this statute if they used it for research and development.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAYNE. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have one more question: Would race horses clear through this station from Latin America and other countries—race horses to be run on the tracks—or for breeding purposes be cleared through this station?

Mr. MAYNE. Race horses are already handled at a facility at the Miami Airport. I believe also that at Clifton, N.J. there is a very small facility, but it does not handle cattle. It is contemplated that this facility will be able to handle about 300 cattle a year. At present it is only contemplated that cattle will be imported through this facility.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I suspect that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be considerably interested in whether race horses might be imported for breeding purposes through this quarantine station because it seems to me his stable needs some improvement.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. The gentleman stated in response to a question posed by the gentleman from Iowa that cattle would be brought in here. Is it not more correct to say that it is not the intent to bring in horses for breeding purposes, but would include cattle first. It would include cattle, swine, sheep, and other commercial food animals. Would this not be a more full explanation of the ultimate purpose of this station?

Mr. MAYNE. Yes; as to the ultimate purpose, but in the testimony of Dr. Anderson from the Department which appears on page 7, of the report, just below the middle of the page, he said they were only contemplating the introduction of about 300 head of cattle per year. He stated further:

At the present time, our technology of disease testing is not considered to be adequate to allow the introduction of swine or sheep. The research people are working on it, and perhaps, in the not too distant future adequate knowledge of the disease will be such that we can also bring in swine and sheep safely, but we do not now consider that our state of knowledge would warrant such introduction.

Our hope is that when the state of knowledge does warrant it we could for the benefit of sheep and hog people bring in sheep and hogs when it is safe to do so.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE), a member of the committee.

(Mr. PRICE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, faced with the rigid prohibitions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, livestock producers have tried to create hybrid vigor and provide better beef and dairy products at a lower cost to the American consumer by experimenting with our domestic livestock genetic base. They have been hampered in their efforts, however, because the genetic base of many classes of our livestock is rooted in only a few of the many breeds of the world. In fact, in some cases, our present breeds are based on the relatively few strains of animals that were imported from northern Europe some 60 to 80 years ago.

Fortunately, the Federal Government has not been entirely blind to the production needs of the livestock industry. In an effort to facilitate the efforts of livestock producers, the Agriculture Department issued regulations in 1965 that would permit, under very stringent restrictions, the importation of animal semen from certain countries declared to be infected with destructive animal diseases or pests. To date, these regulations have only been utilized once; although the Department is currently reviewing two other inquiries about the importation of bull semen from countries adjudged infected with hoof-and-mouth disease.

According to livestock producers, more requests for the importation of animal semen have not been submitted to the Department of Agriculture because of the disadvantages attendant to the practice. The most important disadvantage

seems to be that semen imports do not permit the establishment of a pure-bred nucleus for future breed expansion. Since the importer can obtain only the male side of the genetic strain, he has to continue repeated importations of animal semen in order to maintain his hybrid experiments. In addition, potential importers have complained that the importation of semen is excessively costly in relation to the benefits received; consequently, it is difficult for any but the largest producers to profit from such imports.

Since the mid-sixties, livestock producers, in an effort to import live animals from foreign countries which are considered unsafe under the Tariff Act, have looked to Canada for a source of live animal supply. Canada operates two international animal quarantine stations. When animals are imported into Canada from countries that are infested with destructive animal diseases or pests, they must pass through a strict quarantine procedure. The effectiveness of these procedures is attested to by the fact that no animal carrying hoof-and-mouth disease has ever been released from either of the two Canadian quarantine facilities.

Canada has proved to be a recent source of bull semen for American livestock producers. In addition, a few of the animals themselves have been imported into the United States from Canada, but only after being subjected to rigorous export controls. Canada requires its exporters to obtain an export permit, a permit which only covers a limited number of specified animal breeds. Within these breeds, export privileges have only been granted for male animals, never for females. Canada makes this distinction for the obvious reason; it wants to protect its monopoly position with regard to the importation of foreign livestock.

From the American livestock producer's point of view, the disadvantages to relying on foreign beef imported from Canada is threefold:

First. American producers are confined to bidding on Canadian surplus livestock. If there is no surplus above Canadian domestic needs, American producers go begging.

Second. Since the Canadian exports are limited to live female animals, American producers cannot establish a pure-bred nucleus for future breed expansion, without importing the necessary semen from Canada.

Third. The cost of obtaining foreign animals from Canada is prohibitive. It has been estimated that it costs at least \$5,000 per head to buy livestock declared safe by the Canadian Government.

In looking at this situation from the national interest point of view, it seems to me that American reliance on foreign livestock imported from Canada has certain disadvantages. The initial one is that since many animals are imported from Canada, it would be desirable if the United States controlled the importation and quarantine apparatus. As it stands now, the Department of Agriculture sends American veterinarians to meet any livestock shipments from foreign lands to Canada which would ultimately

be purchased by U.S. producers. This, the Department concedes, is an expensive and burdensome procedure.

The same disadvantages also apply to our running continuing checks on the practices of other countries such as Argentina, France, Germany, Italy, who are seeking to establish quarantine stations for the purpose of shipping livestock into this country.

In my view, if the United States were to establish an adequate international livestock quarantine station of its own, it would solve in large measure, the problems and needs that the livestock producer experiences in regard to the importation of foreign livestock. The establishment of an adequate international livestock quarantine station would also give rise to other desirable conditions. Livestock producers would be able to import and critically evaluate selected foreign breeds not now present in the United States for their ability to improve livestock productivity and livestock quality. In addition, since the facility would be a Federal one, the Department of Agriculture could conduct research in the area of hybrid vigor and publish a running account of its research for the use and benefit of the livestock industry. The Department can also establish an ongoing system for the importation by private industry of larger numbers of breeds or types of livestock that are found to have significant potential usefulness in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is absolutely essential for the United States to establish an adequate international livestock quarantine station if the livestock industry is going to meet the rising demand for meat caused by our rapidly growing population. The Bureau of the Census estimates that by the year 2000 we will have 100 million more people in this country than we have today. By the year 2015, our population will be increased by yet another 100 million people.

This will place a tremendous strain on the productive capabilities and adequacies of our domestic livestock industry. For example, Government experts have estimated that if the cattle industry is to meet consumer demand in the year 2000, the industry will have to produce calves that will have a weaning weight of between 600 and 700 pounds, as compared to the 300 to 400 pounds weaning weight that calves presently have under normal conditions.

The livestock industry can meet the challenges of the future only by the full use and benefit of hybrid vigor. This in turn necessitates the establishment of an adequate American international livestock quarantine station. Through the activities, the research, and the experiments of such a facility, every American will be able to enjoy a greater variety of high-quality livestock products at a reasonable cost in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the House today is whether or not the United States should establish an international livestock quarantine station. This is a matter I have been interested in for several years; for, prior to being elected to Congress, I spent most of my adult life as a rancher and cattleman in the Texas

Panhandle. As a result of this personal experience, I speak with some knowledge on this subject.

My position on the issue is a matter of record. Early in this Congress, I supported a bill similar to the one being considered today.

I did so because, based on my experience, I believe that an international quarantine station would be of great benefit to our livestock industry, an industry which has become a leading component of the agriculture sector of our economy.

As a member of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, I had the advantage of working closely with this legislation from the time I introduced my bill. Throughout the committee deliberations my personal conviction that an international quarantine station was sorely needed was constantly buttressed by both the testimony of the expert witnesses that appeared before the subcommittee and the attitudes of my colleagues. Not only was there no opposition expressed to the proposal at the hearings, the legislation was unanimously reported by both the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, the livestock industry has been a leading component of the farm sector for many years. Its importance is evidenced by the fact that during the first 6 months of 1969, the livestock industry produced \$13.4 billion in cash receipts out of the \$20.5 billion produced by the entire farm sector. The industry has achieved this preeminence because, among other things, consumer demand for meat of all kinds has dramatically increased in recent years.

The industry has responded to the stimulus of consumer demand by altering production and initiating innovations designed to provide the American consumer with high quality meat at a reasonable cost.

As is to be expected, livestock producers, in an attempt to improve the competitive position of the industry are constantly striving to improve the quality of their product and lower their costs of production so that both they and the consumer can enjoy a higher return on their dollar. One important means by which the producer is trying to capitalize on his capabilities through experimenting with different animal blood lines.

Crossbreeding animal blood lines has become common practice in the American livestock industry. Experience has demonstrated that the products of crossbreeding have a significantly higher capacity for both gain and the production of desirable cuts of meat. They have what is called increased hybrid vigor.

Livestock experts have unequivocally declared that if the hybrid vigor of the American livestock industry were increased, it would have several widespread beneficial effects for the industry and the consumer. For the industry it is estimated that increased hybrid vigor would boost by three, the number of calves raised per cow bred. It also would effect sheep and swine in much the same fashion. This is an important increase; in-

creasing the potential production percentage by three would permit a reduction in the present number of beef cows by about 1,200,000 animals without sacrificing current production levels. Inasmuch as annual cow maintenance costs are estimated at \$80 to \$120. This would mean that the 3 percent rise in calf productivity would create a production cost savings amounting to between \$96 and \$108 million at present production levels.

For the consumer it is estimated that hybrid vigor also increases the average weaning weight of a calf by about 90 pounds. The economic value of this increase would be realized by virtue of the fact a hybrid calf would gain more pounds of pre- and post-weaning feedlot gains and would require fewer days on feed before reaching market weight. In this connection, the hybrid vigor could possibly increase feedlot gain by one-half to 1 pound per day. Accordingly, feed required per pound or gain would be reduced by about \$7 and the producer would save about 3 weeks time in the feedlot. This would create significant cost savings which could be passed on to the final consumer in the form of lower market prices for meat.

According to USDA figures, yet another projected consumer benefit of hybrid vigor is that it would reduce waste fat on carcasses of finished slaughter animals by 4 pounds per 100 pounds of carcass weight. The economic importance of this reduction can be illustrated as follows. It is currently estimated that waste fat represents 20 percent of carcass weight. Assuming that the 20 million cattle now on feed average 600 pounds per carcass, a reduction of 4 pounds per 100 weight of carcass equals 24 pounds per head. This savings has two implications: at present levels of production, the amount of edible beef would be increased by about 480 million pounds, or around 2½ pounds of beef for every man, woman, or child in the United States. In addition, present levels of production could be maintained with 800 thousand fewer animals.

Mr. Chairman, under present law, livestock producers cannot take full advantage of the many benefits to be derived from crossbreeding because livestock from many countries around the world is excluded from the United States. The Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, contains an absolute prohibition against the importation of ruminating animals and swine, except certain wild animals for zoos, and fresh, chilled, or frozen meats of such animals from countries declared by the Department of Agriculture to be infected with hoof-and-mouth disease and other destructive animal diseases and parasites such as African swine fever, rinderpest, exotic ticks, and African horse sickness. As an administrative measure, Federal veterinary officials are assigned to various points of entry to the United States. There, with the assistance of trained inspectors, they inspect animals and animal products, poultry and poultry products, hay, straw, and similar materials that might carry destructive animal diseases into the United States. Those animals and materials that do not pass inspection are refused entry.

While I certainly agree that the Federal Government has the responsibility to see that our Nation is not infected with foreign animal diseases that would endanger our livestock industry and reduce its production, it also has the responsibility not to discharge this obligation in such a fashion that it forecloses a major avenue of improving livestock quality. In my view, the present policy of the Federal Government prohibits, as a practical matter, the full use and benefit of crossbreed experimentation. This condition is not a beneficial one; both the consumer and the producer suffer. I believe that the much needed balance between disease protection and livestock improvement can be best achieved by the Federal Government's establishing an adequate international livestock quarantine station on an offshore island where the U.S. Department of Agriculture can effect maximum security precautions to prevent diseased animals and materials from entering the country.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly urge my colleagues to respond to the needs of the domestic livestock industry and the Nation's consumers. It is in their interest that this bill was proposed; it is in their interest that this bill be passed.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11832

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue

such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, after the period insert the following sentence: "The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act."

Page 3, line 11, strike the word "contrary" and strike all of lines 8 and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the words ", including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11832) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 861, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 861, I call up for immediate consideration the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. PURCELL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2306 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 11832, as passed, as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

"SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11832) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in connection with the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EFFECTIVENESS OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in his message on educational reform the President has called for fundamental studies related to the learning process and the effectiveness of education programs. The President listed as the first order of business for the proposed National Institute of Education, the determination of what is needed to make compensatory education efforts successful. This is a matter which is close to the Committee on Education and Labor. For in the past few years a major portion of the committee's time has been devoted to this very subject—that of improving American education, particularly education for disadvantaged children. Within the last year and a half the committee has conducted over a month of hearings on elementary and secondary school programs and we have undertaken two extensive surveys which have involved more than 20,000 local school officials. Mr. Speaker, the committee has firm plans to continue this work.

First priority for the committee and the educational community is completion of the conference on the elementary and secondary school amendments. Immediately after approval of a conference report, the committee will conduct oversight hearings on elementary and secondary education programs. All Members of Congress who have suggestions for changes in education programs or who wish to discuss educational issues will be heard by the committee. In addition, the committee will travel to various sections of the country for the purpose of evaluating on a first-hand basis title I and other elementary and secondary school programs. In addition also, our three excellent education subcommittees are presently carrying out their oversight responsibilities and they will continue this during the coming months.

In summary, all suggestions from the administration, from Members of Congress, from the educational community and from the public at large will be heard and thoroughly considered in our effort to improve American education.

Mr. Speaker, I must today register my deep concern about what amounts to a general indictment of Federal education programs. The suggestion that two-thirds of our involvement in compensatory education is being squandered is, in my judgment, an indictment of the educational leadership in America. It is an indictment with which I wish to disassociate myself and it is an indictment which is in direct conflict with all the evidence the committee has gathered through the hearings and studies I have mentioned. Undoubtedly some funds are not being expended as efficiently or as effectively as they might. On the other hand, school people throughout America have overwhelmingly testified to the effectiveness of title I. Statements from thousands of local administrators pointing to the effectiveness of title I and discussing the "immeasurables" men-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of April 6, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 53

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....8,13	Imports.....15	Poultry.....17
Census.....14	Livestock.....5	Quarantine station.....5
Environment.....2,11	Lumber supply.....9	Salaries.....3
Farm program6,16	Personnel.....18	Textile imports.....7,15
Fees and charges.....12	Pollution.....2,11	Trade fairs.....1
Forests.....9,12,18	Postal rates.....3	Wool.....10
Housing.....4,13		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to House amendment with an amendment to international quarantine station bill. Sen. Hruska inserted Sen. Miller's speech on agriculture in the 1970's. Rep. Rosenthal inserted article deploring sale of infected poultry. Rep. Alexander said "crisis" facing American agriculture and inserted article.

HOUSE

1. TRADE FAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 13171, to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States (H. Rept. No. 91-979). p. H2675
2. ENVIRONMENT. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported H. Res. 562, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should actively participate in the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment (H. Rept. No. 91-981). p. H2675

Rep. Saylor inserted Edward C. Crafts' speech, "Politics and the Environment." pp. H2665-9

3. POSTAL RATES; SALARIES. Received the President's message proposing a pay increase for Federal employees and postal reform (H. Doc. 91-298). pp. H2669-70
4. HOUSING. Rep. Patman said that the housing shortage will "descend to an even more disastrous level during 1970." pp. H2657-61

SENATE

5. LIVESTOCK IMPORTS. Agreed, with amendment, to House amendment to S. 2306, to establish an international quarantine station. The Senate amendment would make its provisions applicable to Guam as well as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. pp. S5076-7
6. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Hruska said that the efforts of Secretary Hardin and the Senate and House Agriculture Committees to "arrive at sound and supportable agreement on legislation deserve our attention and support", and inserted Sen. Miller's speech, "Surveying the 1970's", in agriculture. pp. S5128-30
7. TEXTILE IMPORTS. Sen. Javits inserted newspaper reports of official activity to "freeze" Japanese textile exports for the time being. pp. S5111-2
Sen. Hollings inserted his statement charging the President with failure to act to protect domestic textile interests and presented a S. C. resolution urging the President to regulate textile imports. p. S5125
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Received a letter from the Budget Bureau reporting that the appropriations for certain departments and agencies had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to Appropriations Committee. p. S5114
9. LUMBER SUPPLY. Sen. Hatfield stated that timber is the primary source of income for almost half of Oregon's population, and inserted an article, "Loggers in Oregon Feel Money Market Squeeze." pp. S5125-6

BILLS INTRODUCED

10. WOOL. H. R. 16742, by Rep. Burton, Utah, to extend the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, for 3 years; to Agriculture Committee.
11. ENVIRONMENT; POLLUTION. H. R. 16747, by Rep. Long, Md., to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to ban polyphosphates in detergents and to establish standards and programs to abate and control water pollution by synthetic detergents; to Public Works Committee.
S. 3677, by Sen. Muskie, et al, to establish an independent agency to coordinate the management of programs established to protect and enhance the quality of the environment through the control and abatement of air and water pollution, solid waste contamination, and through other related activities; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author pp. S5115-8
12. FORESTS; FEES AND CHARGES. H. R. 16756, by Rep. Ruppe, to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from national forests located within such States; to Agriculture Committee.

Black, who is advanced in years. It is only a question of time before nature will necessitate his retirement from the Court. Then we have Justice Harlan and Justice Douglas. Three appointments will be coming up, with an existing vacancy.

In the case of Chief Justice Burger, we had no trouble. That appointment received almost the unanimous approbation of this body. There were only three "nays"—and that was a Nixon appointment. That was for the Chief Justice of the United States, the Court of last resort. Then we were confronted with the Haynsworth appointment, which was repudiated by the Senate. Now we have this appointment. I do not know how this body is going to vote today or on Wednesday, but it is going to be a cliff-hanger. I wonder if it is good for the country that we should be so extremely divided on this particular issue, as we are on many, many issues which confront the people of this country.

I think the time has come when there ought to be greater care in the matter of nominations. The thing that has mystified me in both the Haynsworth appointment and the Carswell appointment is that there have been so many developments during the progress of the hearings before the Judiciary Committee and in the Senate debate that apparently were not known at the time the appointment was made. It strikes me that they could be a little more careful in research in the first place, and in the next place, these questions and doubts should go back to the committee for confrontation and consideration. That would be fairer to the nominee and to the Senate.

Frankly, I find it extremely difficult to vote against an official appointment. I said that at the time of the Haynsworth appointment. I think the first time I ever voted against an official appointment was in the case of Mr. Hickel, and the Senator from Maine knows why. He knows the oil situation in my State. The declarations that had been made by Mr. Hickel gave me cause to doubt whether or not he was the right man for the office. Since then he has adequately proved himself and I am very happy to know that.

Take the Haynsworth appointment. The President stood behind him to the end. I suppose that may be a mark of courage of one's convictions. I would like to be the first to give a helping hand to the President of the United States. I have said time and time again, whether it was an Eisenhower or a Nixon, I want to give the President of the United States the benefit of the doubt in any case because of the heavy burden he carries at this time.

The thing that frightens me at this time—and I use the word advisedly—is that here are two appointments to the court of last resort, and they say that beyond the Supreme Court of the United States, your only appeal is to God, Himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. It strikes me that here we are confronted with a very, very sensitive, very soul-searching situation. This is nothing against the integrity of Mr. Carswell. I forgive him for the things he said as a youth. What kind of men are we, when we do not forgive a young man in his twenties for having said something that he repudiates in his older years? I do not hold that against him. But much doubt has been raised as to the competence of the man. Associates of his who at first agreed to recommend him then withdrew their endorsement, and we do not know yet why. Certain responsible members of the committee have asked that the nomination be brought back for further hearing, and we got from the Senator from Arkansas—

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. If I have the time.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator made the statement that colleagues of Judge Carswell seconded his nomination and then withdrew it.

Mr. PASTORE. No, I did not say that.

Mr. GURNEY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. PASTORE. How did the Senator interpret what I said? I did not say that at all.

Mr. GURNEY. I thought the Senator was talking about the judge colleagues of Judge Carswell.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. Judge Tuttle.

Mr. GURNEY. All right.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Florida dispute that?

Mr. GURNEY. Let us set the record straight and see what he actually did.

Mr. PASTORE. What did he do?

Mr. GURNEY. He wrote a letter to the Judiciary Committee, offering to testify.

Mr. PASTORE. And then—

Mr. GURNEY. And the Judiciary Committee never asked him to testify. And he has never contacted the Judiciary Committee to this day. He did have an exchange of telegrams with the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS).

Mr. PASTORE. Why does not the committee call him before the committee and have him testify?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know why.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not strange to the Senator from Florida—

Mr. GURNEY. Let me complete this. I know why he did not testify. It was because he was confused about the Tallahassee golf club incident. I would rather expect that if you could get into the judge's mind today, you would find that he was very embarrassed about the fact that he did misunderstand the golf club incident. That is what the thing was all about. He never did give this endorsement and then withdraw it. That is the point I am trying to correct, because there has been too much representation and misrepresentation of that by a great many Senators.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know about that.

Mr. GURNEY. When the Senator says he gave—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 5 additional

minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact still remains that we are talking about confusion. More than 35 Senators in this body—

Mr. GURNEY. There certainly is confusion—

Mr. PASTORE. I permitted the Senator from Florida to speak. Now I ask that he give me a chance to make an observation on his observation.

The fact still remains that more than 35 Senators are still confused about what Judge Tuttle did or did not do. I, for one, am like the Senator from Arkansas, who said, "Let it go back to committee, and let us find out what Judge Tuttle did say."

If anybody can prove to me that a nominee has the competence, to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States, I do not care whether he comes from Florida or Alaska. This is one country. If the President of the United States wants a constructionist, if he wants a southerner, of course, he has a perfect right to nominate anyone from any part of the country. But what I am saying is that there has been almost a deliberate attempt—I do not know on the part of whom, but one can almost smell it—a deliberate attempt to keep Judge Carswell away from that committee.

I ask the question, Why? Why?

If this man has an explanation about that golf club, then let him come in here and tell us about it.

The point he made—as I read it in the newspapers—was that he came before the committee, and when they asked him whether he was a charter member of that golf club, he said, "No."

Then an affidavit or a memorandum has been produced on the floor of the Senate by two members of the American Bar Association who claim that only the night before, he admitted that he was a charter member.

These things have not cleared up. We are not talking about a minor ward committee. We are not talking about an executive committee in city or State. We are talking about the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

I think we have a right to know all the facts. I repeat, I wish that something would transpire so that I could find it in my heart to hold up the hand of Richard Nixon. I have nothing against him. I have supported him when many of my colleagues found it necessary not to do so.

I have said to the President of the United States that any time there is a doubt in my mind, I will resolve it in his favor.

But, this is more than a doubt. This is a factual situation. I think that we should have an explanation.

They say this is a question as between liberals and conservatives. That is not so at all. They talk about politics. My goodness gracious, there are half a dozen Republicans who want to stand behind the President and who are going to campaign with the President, yet they are going to vote against this appointment.

I ask the question, Why? Why?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the Senator looked in my direction and I am quite flattered. I stand for law and order and it is about time we had a little more of it. It is time to stop apologizing to every criminal that gets hauled into court. That is the issue today. It is time to face it squarely.

Mr. PASTORE. It is. I am the first one who said just that. I am the first one who criticized the Supreme Court on pornography. I am the first one who said that. The Court went way out on the question of pornography. I am against that. I stood up for Burger. I will stand up for any Nixon appointment, provided it is proved to me that he should be the man.

The allegation of playing politics is poppycock. Any reasonable man on that side of the aisle knows it.

Let us cut out the subterfuge. Let us stand up and look at the facts.

That is all I have to say, and, Mr. President, if my 5 minutes have not been used up, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Has it expired again?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee and then I will come back to Florida. I will come back to Florida [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator has just said that we should look at the facts.

Should we not first have the facts to look at?

Mr. PASTORE. That is what I mean. That is certainly what I mean. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Tennessee has used reverse English. But, it is plain either way. It is very plain.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, again I want to set the record straight. Does the Senator from Rhode Island know—I know he did not do it intentionally—but I believe that he made a misstatement—

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. GURNEY. No; not at this time.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator will recall—

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida—

Mr. PASTORE. They have given me 5 minutes. We should be generous and let him speak. Let us be generous here.

Mr. BAYH. Yes, but we do not want to use all the Senator's time—

Mr. PASTORE. We do not want to be picayunish here. Let us stand up like men. Let us discuss this thing openly.

Mr. GURNEY. That is what I want to do about the golf club incident. The Senator stated that Judge Carswell denied he was a charter member of the corporation. He never did any such thing at all. As a matter of fact, he admitted or readily answered a question of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) that he signed the charter of incorporation.

What he did say, so as to keep the record straight, in answer to a question of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), whether Judge Carswell was an officer or a director, and he said "no"—which is true. Senator HRUSKA asked him if he was an incorporator and he said that he was not. That is a technical point, but it is an interesting thing that the charter of incorporation says nothing about the incorporator, but it does talk about subscribers.

But the point made in this business about the golf club is that what the judge was testifying to during that testimony on the first day—and a little on the second day, too—was that he was not one of the originators of the golf club and never had anything to do with it beyond putting in \$100 which was returned to him a few months later. That was the whole of the business. That is what the argument is about.

We should check the record and get it straight, that he never denied that he was a charter member of the corporation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the way I read it. But, if that is all there is to the case, why can he not come before the committee and explain it, and that will make everyone happy.

I wonder why this resistance not to allow him to do it? That is what mystifies me, because this is the one place we should be open and above board, in the case of a Supreme Court nomination.

If a Senator is in doubt among the people, they can take care of him at the next election.

If a Congressman is in doubt with the people, they can take care of him at the next election.

If a President is in doubt with the people, then the people can take care of him at the next election.

But, a member of the Supreme Court, once confirmed, cannot be touched. Even the Constitution cannot touch him. Even the question of his salary cannot be touched. That is, we can raise it, but we cannot lower it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. I yield further.

Mr. GURNEY. On the point of not sending it back to committee, if the Senator will read the RECORD carefully, he will note that all the events which happened and all the testimony surrounding the golf course incident shows nothing to be cleared up. It is all in the record as plain as day—every bit of it.

The answers were candid and honest. Why replot the ground all over again, just for the sake of turning over new earth? There is no point in doing that.

Mr. PASTORE. I have the highest respect for the Senator's point of view.

I have the highest respect for those who differ with what the Senator has just said and their doubts should be resolved in committee with the judge before them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield me 1 minute to take care of a little item?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for that purpose.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2306.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animals quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals

within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the United States, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 2306, with an amendment, which I send to the desk at this point and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The BILL CLERK. It is proposed to strike out "and the Virgin Islands" where it appears before the period at the end of section 2 and insert the following: "Guam, and the Virgin Islands, contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this amendment would restore to the bill, language which was in the bill when it passed the Senate and which is necessary to the bill's clarity. It would also extend the penalties provided by the bill to the importation of animals into Guam contrary to the provisions of the bill.

Both of these amendments were recommended by the Department of Agriculture, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from the Department making these recommendations printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1970.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 2306, as amended and passed by the House. The bill is entitled "To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes."

The House amended S. 2306 by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the text of H.R. 11832 as previously passed by the House. The text of H.R. 11832 differs in certain respects from that of S. 2306, as passed by the Senate. Our comments are directed toward those differences.

We recommend the restoration of the language deleted by the House from Section 2 of H.R. 11832 (Union Calendar No. 349), page 3, lines 11-13 which reads as follows: "contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder". This language, included under the Senate-passed version of S. 2306, is intended to make

the provisions and penalties of 18 U.S.C. 545 applicable to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals therefrom to other parts of the United States when such actions are contrary to the conditions prescribed in the regulations which Section 1 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue. The deletion of the language makes the bill ambiguous. The bill would be susceptible of being construed as applying the penalties of 18 U.S.C. 545 even when the prescribed conditions are met, which is clearly not the intent. Such deletion, in the light of the House Report on the bill (H. Rept. 91-776, page 9), leaves a question whether these penalties are to apply in case of a failure to comply with the conditions. We believe that it is essential that clear provision be made for the application of such penalties to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals therefrom to other parts of the United States contrary to the conditions prescribed in the regulations under the bill.

We concur in the addition by the House on page 3, lines 13 and 14 of the bill, of the phrase "including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands" but also suggest that a reference be added to Guam so as to protect all the areas within the definition of the term "United States" in the Act of July 2, 1962 (21 U.S.C. 134).

There is no objection to omission of the commas in lines 13 and 14 on page 2 of the bill after "including" and "to".

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this bill provides for an international quarantine station and the bringing into the United States through the quarantine station under proper proposed safeguards of animals which might otherwise be excluded from the United States by the quarantine laws. The necessary safeguards are provided in the bill by making the penalties of the Antismuggling Act applicable to animals brought into the quarantine station, or through the quarantine station into other parts of the United States, "contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued" under the act. The House amendment omitted from this provision the words "contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder". Since the entire purpose of the provision is to prohibit the importation of animals brought in contrary to the regulations, the omission of the quoted language leaves the meaning of the provision in doubt. The amendment I have just proposed would restore this language and eliminate this ambiguity.

The House amendment extended the penalty provision of the bill to cover the bringing of animals through the station into Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The Department of Agriculture has recommended that this part of the House amendment be extended to cover animals brought through the quarantine station into Guam, and the amendment just proposed would make this extension. This would conform the definition of "United States" used in section 2 of the act with that in the act of June 2, 1962, entitled "An act to provide greater protection

against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes"—21 U.S.C. 134.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of the Senator from North Carolina regarding S. 3206.

The amendment will make restoration of language which is necessary to clarity of the bill; and extend the bill's penalties to importation of animals into Guam contrary to provisions of the bill.

The amendment will not adversely affect the amendments of the other body—but will make them more clearly effective.

Approval of the amendment is in order. I urge its approval.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is an agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate continued with the consideration of the nomination of George Harrold Carswell to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

I support, with great confidence, the nomination by President Nixon of the Honorable G. Harrold Carswell for membership on the Supreme Court.

My reasons for doing so are clear, to me, and simple.

When Judge Carswell's name was proposed for membership on the court of appeals, I went over his entire record and discussed him with several colleagues, in this Chamber, and in their offices. I also discussed him with several personal friends of long standing of mine who now live in Florida and know the gentleman intimately.

I went around to see him when he was here for the hearing as I wanted to get a personal impression of him. All of the things that I learned and observed and the impression I gained of him were good. He was later confirmed to the court of appeals unanimously by this body.

Furthermore, since the present nomination, which is a highly important one, came before the Senate, I have gone over the record again. I have closely examined his services as a member of the court of appeals, checking on him there through people I know.

I have gone through a great deal of the debate that has occurred here. And I have followed the rest of it in the RECORD. I have examined the high points of the hearings in the matter. I have watched and observed the man at those hearings. I got the impression one gets of a man that is on television. He impressed me all the way through as being honest and straight and wanting to tell the truth. And I believe he did tell the truth about everything when he was asked.

A man's memory is not altogether perfect all the time as to small transactions over years past. But I have no doubt about the basic, fundamental character and qualifications of this man.

There has been a very active and legitimate opposition to him by able men, encouraged and supported by an active and vigilant press, that has been very thorough. They have used all their resources, but they have not found one single circumstance of any substance to discredit Judge Carswell or his record or that mitigates against his qualifications.

Several points on the positive side of the nomination are outstanding. Those Members who personally know Judge Carswell and his record approve him and his record in a very firm, solid way. There are a few exceptions, but very few.

The opposition comes largely from those who do not know him and do not have personal knowledge of his record. Their opposition is based on what they have been told. I do not believe they have obtained the true facts throughout all of Judge Carswell's services.

Through all the record of the hearings and the record of the debates and the discussion, there is not one single fact or allegation that reflects on his character, his honor, or his integrity. For a judge, these qualities are the essentials.

On the other hand, his entire conduct, his record, his appearance, his outlook on life show in a positive way that he does have these qualities and this integrity. They reflect sturdy character. Further, these qualities are fully and admirably reflected in his official record as a practicing lawyer and as a judge over a number of years.

Those are the qualities that will guide him and sustain him when he becomes a member of the Court.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has gone to the marketplace, so to speak, and picked a judge for our highest court. He went to the place where lawyers and judges are made—the courtroom. The administration of justice is not a theory. It is not an academic matter. It is not just a matter of the cold learning of the law. It is not a matter of academic rating.

The administration of justice involves the day-to-day application of a set of facts from real life to the law of the subject matter. And this is what Judge Carswell has been doing now for years. And his record shows that he has been doing it well. This is the area where Judge Carswell has special valuable knowledge and experience. This is the area where many who have been criticizing him do not have knowledge or experience.

Law professors and law school deans have opposed him. No one honors law professors and law school deans more than I do. No one owes them any more than I owe those I had the privilege of attending law school under. But their points are not the questions to be decided by a judge. A judge must take the hard facts of a case as he finds them and apply these facts to the law.

Those who have criticized Judge Carswell are valuable to the profession, but their field is limited to learning. And the exercise of responsibility by a judge on an important court, especially the highest court in our land, requires an additional quality that I will mention now.

I have not heard it mentioned heretofore in the debate.

A good judge must have an abundance of commonsense. He must have, to use an old, homely word, gumption. He must be practical, and he must have reasoning ability and an understanding of life as it is—rather than as it should be.

Judge Carswell has these qualities and he possesses the character that will sustain him in his work on the Court.

I believe his nomination will be confirmed and that he will be of special value to the Supreme Court, where I believe he will render fine services.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska, and I yield back such time, if any, as I have remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for yielding.

I would like to say that I have been pleased to be here to listen to the discussion and the indication is that there is a difference of opinion here.

I think that is proper. I think it is up to the Members of the Senate to decide and to sift out the values with respect to the differences of opinion that exists.

I have been concerned for some time about the difference of opinion that exists on the Court itself where we have so many very important decisions made on the basis of 5-to-4 opinions. They are determined many times by the decision of one man. The Court itself has been uncertain on many occasions. A remark was made about political considerations. I can remember when that started. I can remember years ago when there was a definite, designed attempt to pack the Supreme Court in order to achieve certain considerations and plans of the Chief Executive. I lived through that. Maybe some of our younger colleagues have forgotten that phase of our history.

I point out that in this case I have read the long document consisting of the hearings that went on for 5 days. And I have looked at the resulting vote of the members of the committee. And I must say that this is a very impressive group. They saw fit to approve the nomination not by a cliff-hanger, but by quite a majority.

I have reread the record, and I have listened to the debate. And I have seen all sorts of attempts, I believe, to create the impression of impropriety and to create the appearance that there may be a lack of quality in this candidate. I am not impressed.

This morning I listened to the "Today" show, and I am going to do something that I do not think is customary here. I will ask the distinguished minority leader if he will do the Senate a favor and repeat some of the things he said this morning.

I think it was one of the most conclusive presentations of the facts that has been made in this case that I have heard. There was some historical background which might bear repetition.

I would respectfully request that the Senator from Michigan repeat for the Senators present and for the Record some of the things he mentioned this morning with respect to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the very kind words of the distinguished Senator from California. I am not altogether sure what the Senator might have reference to.

Those who have bandied about very freely and loosely the word "mediocre" with respect to this nominee, in many cases have not read the record.

I have said before, and I repeat on the floor of the Senate, that this nominee is among the best qualified ever to be nominated to the Supreme Court. I say that because in terms of his judicial experience and training, his qualifications far exceed many who have been appointed to the Court and confirmed in the past.

Judge Carswell, at the age of 33, after graduating from Duke University, which I believe is the university the President of the United States attended, and also receiving his law degree after attending the University of Georgia and the Mercer University Law School, was designated and appointed district attorney and served in that capacity for 5 years with distinction. At a very early age he was made a district judge and served in that capacity for 11 years. More than one-half of the trials he conducted, I understand, were criminal trials.

There has been something made of the fact that he has been reversed in a number of his decisions. I would offer the comment that it may be too bad that many of his criminal decisions were reversed; the Nation would be better off if we had somebody on the Supreme Court with the kind of experience he has had in criminal trials, someone who might see that such decisions were not reversed in the future. He also served for nearly 1 year on the court of appeals. This is more judicial experience than anyone now sitting on the Supreme Court had when he appointed, other than Chief Justice Burger. If one were to exclude Chief Justice Burger and Justice Brennan from consideration, it can be said that Judge Carswell has more judicial experience than all the other sitting justices of the Supreme Court put together; I refer, of course, to their judicial experience at the time of appointment.

I know that some in this body disagree with his philosophy, but I do not think he should be rejected on that ground.

I do not agree with those who say he is not qualified. I believe he is well qualified, and that there is more likelihood with respect to his appointment that he will develop into a great and distinguished justice than was the case with respect to many appointments in the past.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that a precept laid down by the Nixon adminis-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of April 23, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 64

CONTENTS

Adjourned.....11,25	Foreign trade.....23	Quarantine station.....5
Air pollution.....9	Forests.....15,29	Reclamation.....6,15
Appropriations.....4	Housing loans.....30	Recreation.....15
Arbor Day.....12	Lands.....8,15,17,28	Rural areas.....30
Budget.....4	Legislative program.....20	School lunch.....1,14
Disaster relief.....2,28	Livestock.....5,13	Selective service.....3
Economy.....10	Meat inspection.....13	Subsidy payments.....7,21
Family assistance.....24	National Arboretum.....19	Watersheds.....18
Firefighters.....8,28	Peanuts.....27	Wilderness.....15
Fish farming.....22	Personnel.....32	Wild rivers.....31
Flood grading.....26	Properties.....15	World weather.....16

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses appointed conferees on school lunch bill. Both Houses received President's disaster relief message. Rep. Conte inserted list of ASC committeemen receiving subsidy payments. Senate committee reported bill to extend boundaries of Toiyabe National Forest. Sen. Cooper and others introduced and discussed disaster relief bill.

HOUSE

1. **SCHOOL LUNCH.** Both Houses appointed conferees on H. R. 515, to strengthen and improve the food service programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. pp. H3369, S6101
2. **DISASTER RELIEF.** Both Houses received from the President a message containing legislative proposals for 1970 disaster relief programs, and a message transmitting a report, "Report on Federal Disaster Assistance in 1969"; (H. Doc. No. 91-323 and H. Doc. 91-325); to Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and Public Works Committee. pp. S6037-9, H3371-4

3. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Both Houses received the President's selective service message proposing immediate as well as long-range reform of the selective service laws (H. Doc. 91-324); to Armed Services Committees. pp. H3374-6, S6040-1

Received from the Director of Selective Service a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to Armed Services Committee. p. H3444

4. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal year 1970 in indefinite amounts in budget authority for authorized civilian and military pay increases of the Government (H. Doc. 322); to Appropriations Committee. p. H3444

5. QUARANTINE STATION. Concurred in Senate amendment to S. 2306, providing for the establishment of an international quarantine station. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H3369-70

6. RECLAMATION. Conferees were appointed on S. 2062, administration of acreage limitation of Federal reclamation laws and on S. 743, the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oreg.-Wash.. p. H3369

7. SUBSIDY PAYMENTS. Rep. Conte inserted a list of ASC committeemen who hold interests in farms which received subsidy payments, and stated that the list "provides a striking illustration of the reason why the Department of Agriculture has consistently opposed all meaningful efforts to eliminate the scandal of huge farm subsidy payments." pp. H3426-7

8. LANDS; FIREFIGHTERS. Received from Interior proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and to twice renew such contracts; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. H3445

9. AIR POLLUTION. The "Daily Digest" states that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare approved a clean bill on the Clean Air Act. p. D393

10. ECONOMY. Rep. Fulton, Tenn., criticized the continued use of high interest rates to fight inflation and suggested that "there are other tools available to the administration." p. H3425

11. ADJOURNED until Mon., April 27. p. H3444

SENATE

12. ARBOR DAY. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 251, to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of 1970 "National Arbor Day (p. S6112). This bill now goes to the President. The bill had been reported earlier in the day (S. Report No. 91-790). p. S6082

Sen. Hruska hailed the 98th Annual Arbor Day Celebration in Nebr. and inserted an article honoring former Secretary of Agriculture Morton. pp. S6077-8

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. R. Walker, First Baptist Church, Marion, Ill., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, and our God, God of this Nation and all nations, we bow before Thee with grateful hearts for our many blessings. We thank Thee for this great Nation with all its resources, opportunities, and people. Give to us a spirit within to match the resources without.

As we confront the problems of this day, grant us the grace and courage to seek first the kingdom of God that we may be enriched in our Nation with a great spiritual heritage. Then make us humble in the acceptable of that heritage.

Instill the moral integrity and courage in these our leaders to stand for the hard right against any easy or expedient wrong that might seem attractive.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 21, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 15, 1970, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On April 15, 1970:

H.R. 11612. An act to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act to provide additional funds for the District of Columbia Bail Agency for fiscal year 1970.

THE REVEREND C. R. WALKER

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in recognizing me at this time. I wish to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Dr. Latch, our beloved Chaplain of the House of Representatives, for permitting one of southern Illinois' finest ministers, the Reverend C. R. Walker, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Marion, Ill., to give the invocation today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out the fact that in our busy lives so many times we overlook the great work done by our spiritual leaders. I again want to thank you and our beloved Chaplain of the House, Dr. Latch, for giving us the opportunity of bringing in from our congressional districts these able servants of His service royale to help us in our spir-

itual guidance. Reverend Walker is a lifelong friend and is a leader in his own right. He does this great body honor by his presence.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2062, ADMINISTRATION OF ACREAGE LIMITATION OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2062) to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, JOHNSON of California, FOLEY, HOSMER, and MCCLURE.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 743, TOUCHET DIVISION, WALLA WALLA PROJECT, OREGON-WASHINGTON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 743) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, JOHNSON of California, FOLEY, HOSMER, and BURTON of Utah.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 17123, MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS, 1971, UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Re-

serve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 515, TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AND THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 515) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify responsibilities related to providing free and reduced-price meals and preventing discrimination against children, to revise program matching requirements, to strengthen the nutrition training and education benefits of the programs, and otherwise to strengthen the food service programs for children in schools and service institutions, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I correct in my understanding that this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee, and that he is totally in agreement with the conference?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, PUCINSKI, WILLIAM D. FORD, AYRES, and QUIE.

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2306) to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 12, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "and the Virgin Islands," and insert: ", Guam, and the Virgin Islands, contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNK MAIL POLLUTION

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, junk mail pollution is a major contributor to the ecological crisis on which this Nation is focusing attention this week.

To begin with, millions of trees must be cut down to produce all the junk which crams your mailbox, bends the backs of the letter carriers, and adds to the burdens of the taxpayers. Second, all these gimmicks, contests, prizes, and pressures used by junk mail are only designed to force the purchase of more and more items which add to the solid waste disposal problem. Then the trash has to be burned, thereby polluting the air.

We must wake up and realize that progress can no longer be measured in the sheer quantity of goods produced. The quality of American life and the protection of our environment are higher goals which must be accorded higher priority.

The junk mail lawyers and lobbyists have now been joined by the accountants who are now trying to prove that junk mail does pay its way. This mumbo-jumbo of the accountants avoids the main issue which is that junk mail pollution is a threat to the quality of American life and a threat to our environment. Junk mail is such an outrageous nuisance that a heavy nuisance tax should be placed on junk mailers for insulting the American people by deluging them with millions of pieces of unwanted junk every day.

Let us end junk pollution. You get fined if you throw litter on somebody else's front lawn; what about littering people's mailboxes?

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GUDE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RULES OF DESTRUCTION

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the Santa Maria, Calif. Times. It is as follows:

[From the Santa Maria, Calif. Times, Apr. 17, 1970]

RULES OF DESTRUCTION

We received a note from a woman this week in which she enclosed an interesting bulletin which shows how long and in what manner Communism has aimed at our destruction.

The bulletin noted that in 1919 allied forces obtained some Communist rules for revolution. As you read the rules, think about the conditions in the country today and consider the rules in relation to those conditions.

We quote the Red rules.

A. Corrupt the young, get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity, thereby get people's minds off their government, by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

C. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

D. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding them up to contempt and ridicule.

E. Always preach true Democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthless as possible.

F. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

G. Promote unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the government toward such disorders.

H. By spacious argument cause breakdown of the moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word.

I. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

The note, sent by Jane Tackitt of Nipomo, ended with the comment, "My prayer for the nation is that young people wake up and see how they are being used, and then strike back for America."

We concur, emphatically.

DATE PERISHABLE PACKAGED FOODS FOR BENEFIT OF CONSUMER

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to break the code on food products, to date-stamp them so that shoppers will know whether the canned and packaged goods on their grocers' shelves are outdated.

The average housewife does not have the time to become a cryptanalyst, deciphering these often hard-to-find, and usually impossible to understand, coded date stamps on perishable products.

Surveys have revealed that such coded dates, placed there for the benefit of store employees to indicate when perishable products should be removed from sale, may consist of a short series of numbers, a series of letters, or both, and that they may indicate either the pack-

aging date or the last day of "shelf life" of the product.

The food industry should let the most important involved—the consumer—know the truth about the last usable date of any perishable product. There should not be any secret about the freshness of our food. The bill I am introducing today would require that all perishable or semiperishable foods be clearly labeled as to expiration date and would include all meat, poultry, fish, dairy products, eggs, fruit, vegetables, bread, coffee, or any other foods the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may designate as perishable or semiperishable.

HAPPY EARTHDAY

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Earth Day and the emphasis was on our environment, what we can do to preserve it, to clean it up, to keep it livable.

Many different groups were involved in programs yesterday at many schools and many different places across the Nation. People make debris, and the same people are primarily responsible for cleaning it up.

Hopefully, this was the start of a real, long range effort by people, by civic groups, by business and by government at all levels to make our world a better place in which to live.

Hopefully, this is not just the latest fad of young people, tired of marching and demonstrating in other causes, hopefully, it is not just another gimmick perpetrated by ambitious politicians or a worried people.

There is no doubt today that man has fouled large segments of his planet pretty thoroughly. We have dirtied the air, we have polluted the water, and we have cluttered the landscape.

Fortunately, it is not too late to do something about it. Certainly this Republican administration recognizes that fact and has called for action on many fronts.

I would hope this Congress would also take up the challenge seriously and approve the programs that are necessary to do the job. If we do not join with the President in taking the necessary leadership, we cannot ask the people of America to join in the task that must be done.

MAKE IT UNPROFITABLE FOR BUSINESS OR GOVERNMENT TO POLLUTE OUR ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. WEICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that those groups and individuals that yesterday celebrated Earth Day will make a positive contribution for years to the cause of cleaning up our environment.

It is easy to place the blame for pollution, much easier than it is to enunciate practical cures.



Public Law 91-239
91st Congress, S. 2306
May 6, 1970

An Act

84 STAT. 202

To provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to establish and maintain an international animal quarantine station within the territory of the United States. The quarantine station shall be located on an island selected by the Secretary of Agriculture where, in his judgment, maximum animal disease and pest security measures can be maintained. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire land or any interest therein, by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise and construct or lease buildings, improvements, and other facilities as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such quarantine station. The Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept any gift or donation of money, personal property, buildings, improvements, and other facilities for the purpose of conducting the functions authorized under this Act. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to prevent the introduction or dissemination of livestock or poultry disease or pests, animals may be brought into the quarantine station from any country, including but not limited to those countries in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and subsequently moved into other parts of the United States, in accordance with such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine are adequate in order to prevent the introduction into and the dissemination within the United States of livestock or poultry diseases or pests. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate in such manner as he deems appropriate, with other North American countries or with breeders' organizations or similar organizations or with individuals within the United States regarding importation of animals into and through the quarantine station and to charge and collect reasonable fees for use of the facilities of such station from importers. Such fees shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the operating expenses of the quarantine station. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. The provisions and penalties of section 545 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the bringing of animals to the quarantine station or the subsequent movement of animals to other parts of the

International
animal quaran-
tine station.
Establishment.

Acceptance of
gifts, etc.

Cooperation with
breeders' orga-
nizations.

Collection of
fees.

Smuggling penal-
ties.
62 Stat. 716;
68 Stat. 782.

United States, including Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, contrary to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary in regulations issued hereunder.

Appropriation.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Approved May 6, 1970.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 91-776 accompanying H.R. 11832 (Comm. on Agriculture).
SENATE REPORT No. 91-638 (Comm. on Agriculture and Forestry).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 116 (1970):

Jan. 30, considered and passed Senate.

Mar. 4, considered and passed House, amended, in lieu of H.R. 11832.

Apr. 6, Senate agreed to House amendment, with amendment.

Apr. 23, House agreed to Senate amendment.